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**Uniqueness**

**2ac – no pass**

#### Won’t pass the House – preference for piecemeal reform, border security, and lack of momentum

Martin 7/10/13 (Gary, “House GOP resists calls for comprehensive immigration reform”, <http://www.chron.com/news/nation-world/article/House-GOP-resists-calls-for-comprehensive-4658690.php>, CMR)

House Republicans expressed a clear preference for a deliberate, patchwork approach to immigration reform Wednesday, telling their leaders they favored border security measures before any consideration of citizenship proposals.¶ "We are very anti-comprehensive - we are all about piecemeal," said Rep. John Fleming, R-La.¶ Most GOP lawmakers apparently were unmoved by pleas from national party leaders including former President George W. Bush to reach a consensus and move forward to tackle the problem.¶ "The only consensus was on border security first," said Rep. Lamar Smith, R-San Antonio.¶ Path to citizenship¶ The hours-long meeting was seen as a key moment in the national immigration debate, and one that appeared to halt momentum on the politically volatile issue.¶ The Senate passed a sweeping immigration reform bill last month on a bipartisan 68-32 vote.¶ That bill would create a 13-year path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants here illegally and would provide legal permanent status within six months.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, repeated that he would not take up the Senate bill without the support of a majority of Republicans in the House. But he warned the caucus that inaction on the issue could be a strategic mistake.¶ Rep. John Culberson, R-Houston, said citizenship was unlikely to draw the GOP support needed to pass in the House.¶ "It's unnecessary, it's illogical and it's self-destructive. This is a law enforcement issue," Culberson said.¶ "It would be a direct affront to every legal immigrant," Rep. Tom McClintock, R-Calif., said of providing undocumented immigrants citizenship.¶ McClintock's sentiment was shared by many members who oppose citizenship as an amnesty to lawbreakers.

#### Odds are slim – fights over citizenship and border security

Berman 7/10/13 (Russell, “Boehner warns House GOP will be weaker without immigration reform”, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/310259-boehner-gop-would-be-in-much-weaker-position-without-action-on-immigration>, CMR)

But opponents of any legislation providing a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants said there was no consensus on immigration's most controversial issue.¶ “There is little consensus in there for doing anything other than border security," said Rep. Tim Huelskamp (R-Kan.).¶ Rep. Steve King (R-Iowa) also said the conference was deeply divided on the question of legalization. “I think it is just about 50-50,” he said.¶ A recurring concern among Republicans in the meeting was that the Obama administration could not be trusted to enforce new immigration laws in the wake of its decision to delay the enforcement of a key element of the president’s own signature healthcare law. Boehner and other members of the leadership echoed that sentiment in a statement following the meeting, in which they declared the House would address immigration reform in a piecemeal approach rather than taking up any single bill.

#### Immigration reform won’t pass the house- takes momentum into account

Crowe 7/7 (J.D. Moderately disturbed cartoonist/columnist for Alabama Media Group, “Senate immigration reform bill will be chewed up and spit out in the House (JD Crowe),” http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2013/07/immigration\_reform\_heads\_to\_th.html, ME)

The U.S. Senate passed its version of immigration reform and now it heads to the U.S. House of Representatives where it will be chewed up and spit out like a bad piece of meat.¶ Even though the bill enjoyed bipartisan support and was passed handily in the Senate, 68-32, its future was foreshadowed by the 'nay' votes of Alabama's Sen. Jeff Sessions and Sen. Richard Shelby, who are more aligned politically with the 'just say no' Tea Party-flavored House than they are with the 'Gang of 8' Senate.¶ No Chihuahuas were harmed, eaten or locked inside a hot vehicle in the production of this cartoon.¶ "The House is not going to take up and vote on whatever the Senate passes," House Speaker John Boehner said, his face a-glow from the political heat he anticipates in the battle ahead. ¶ From the linked al.com story: 'At its core, the bill includes numerous steps to prevent future illegal immigration, while at the same time it offers a chance at citizenship to the 11 million immigrants now living in the country unlawfully. Sen. Shelby called it "the mother of all amnesties." ' ¶ Many House Republicans represent red states like Alabama, where folks read 'path to citizenship' and hear 'amnesty for criminals.' The idea that sells here: Make the border harder to cross and life harder to live for those that come here illegally. ¶ Polls show most American voters strongly support immigration reform that includes tougher border patrol as well as a path to citizenship, as offered by the Senate bill.¶ The Senate Gang of 8 represents a number of GOP leaders, like John McCain, Marco Rubio, Jeb Bush and Lindsey Graham, who believe they need to put the immigration issue behind them before they can elect another Republican president. ¶ And there are others, like Rush Limbaugh, who say the GOP is "authoring its demise" with immigration reform. A Republican courting the Hispanic vote is wasting the party's time and money. ¶ The Senate produced a bill that isn't perfect, but it does toughen border security while giving illegals a path - not a walk in the park - to citizenship. It's at least a start to the conversation for those willing to talk.¶ Whether you like the taste of the Senate's bill or not, don't get too attached. It's got as much chance in the House as a Chihuahua has of surviving an Arizona summer locked inside an El Camino with the windows rolled up.¶ Will the House be able to cook up its own immigration bill that's tough enough for its red state, red meat voters?

#### Won’t pass without stricter boarder provisions

Bowman 7/7 (Brian, writer for Voice of America, “Washington Week: Focus on US Immigration Reform,”http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2013/07/immigration\_reform\_heads\_to\_th.htm, ME)

WASHINGTON — Immigration reform remains in Washington’s political spotlight this week. Attention will be focused on whether and how the House of Representatives proceeds on an overhaul of federal immigration laws.¶ Congress returns to work after a weeklong recess. Many legislators heard passionate and pointed words in their home districts on immigration reform.¶ “We are here today as a coalition, as a group to put the pressure where the fight will be: on the House [of Representatives]," said immigration reform protester Richard McDaniel.¶ Last month, the Democratically-controlled Senate passed a bill that would boost U.S border security, streamline the legal immigration process, and provide a path to citizenship for millions of undocumented workers. Action in the Republican-controlled House is far from assured.¶ Represenative Bob Goodlatte is chairman of the House Judiciary committee, which oversees immigration matters. "I do not think a special pathway to citizenship should be provided at all," he said.¶ Instead, many Republicans want to focus on border security first and foremost. But an enforcement-only approach that fails to address the legal status of the undocumented is unacceptable to many Democrats, including President Barack Obama.¶ Only if both houses of Congress pass an identical version of immigration reform would the bill go to the White House for Mr. Obama’s signature.¶ House Speaker John Boehner has given no indication a vote will be held.

### 1ar – no pass – house

#### Won’t pass – several votes shy in the House – best expert agrees

Avila 7/9/13 (Jim, “Path to 218: Why one political scientist is skeptical the House will get the votes to pass immigration reform”, <http://news.yahoo.com/blogs/power-players-abc-news/path-218-why-one-political-scientist-skeptical-house-112127290.html>, CMR)

What are the chances that the House of Representatives will pass comprehensive immigration reform?¶ Political scientist Tom Wong has been taking a scientific approach to answering that very question, tallying votes and crunching numbers to forecast the potential outcomes, and tells Power Players he’s “skeptical” the House will follow the Senate’s lead and pass a comprehensive bill.¶ Based on his own vote tally, Wong says there are 203 solid ‘yes’ votes in the House and an additional 11 votes that are likely but not guaranteed.¶ “If we take that 203 number, add 11 more we're at 214, and we need 218 for a majority, so this ends up being a game of inches,” says the assistant professor at the University of California, San Diego. “It could go either way in the House.”¶ The 11 votes that Wong has designated as maybe votes are for representatives who are facing tight reelection races in 2014.¶ Wong says more than 60 percent of congressional districts are not racially diverse, with white populations making up more than 80 percent of those districts.¶ “If we just make these broad assumptions that immigration reform is going to benefit communities of color and we have a lot of representatives who don't have large communities of color in their district, then a ‘no’ vote may actually reflect the preferences of one's constituency,” Wong says.¶ Wong has a track record of success in his approach to vote counting, which takes into account complex profiles for each member of Congress. As far back as March, his models predicted that the Senate would get 67 ‘yes’ votes — and the final tally of the Senate’s vote came out to 68.¶ Wong says “there’s a lot of pessimism right now” that the Republican-run House may decide not to consider the Senate’s bill at all and instead choose to address immigration reform in smaller pieces.

#### CIR won’t pass, there’s no pressure on House Republicans to pass the bill

Berman 7/3 (Russell, July 3, 2013, “No pressure on House Republicans to tackle immigration reform”, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/309049-no-pressure-on-gop-to-tackle-immigration>, 7/8/2013, PB)

House Republicans aren’t feeling pressure to tackle comprehensive immigration reform — not from the Senate, not from the business and religious communities and not from the many GOP-aligned groups backing the effort.¶ From Karl Rove to Jeb Bush to Grover Norquist, an array of Republican heavyweights have called on the House GOP to embrace immigration reform. ¶ ¶ Yet the response from many House conservatives has been little more than a shrug.¶ “The economy is still the main issue,” said Rep. Steve Scalise (R-La.), the chairman of the conservative Republican Study Committee. He cited healthcare as another more pressing national priority than immigration.¶ Like many in the House GOP, Scalise wants to strengthen border security and fix the broken parts of the immigration system, but he and other Republicans see few incentives in agreeing to a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants despite warnings of demographic doom for the GOP in national elections if the party doesn’t improve its standing with Hispanic voters.¶ Indeed, many rank-and-file Republicans see danger in voting for a bill that could hurt them in districts that in most cases are dominated by conservative white voters

#### CIR will pass, even if Republicans don’t want to look like bigots they’ve already done so and nothing can change that

Green, 7/9 (Joshua, 7/9/2013, “A GOP case against immigration reform”, <http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2013/07/08/can-republicans-vote-against-immigration-reform-and-still-get-hispanic-vote/a03icfdero4CgG0N2hfajL/story.html>, 7/9/2013, PB)

In fact, Kyl is ambivalent about the Senate bill. “I don’t know how I would have voted on it,” he admitted. “Unfortunately, it’s almost too late to correct the party’s problems for a lot of people. There’s an assumption [about the GOP’s hostility to Hispanics] that’s just kind of sunken in that Democrats and the media are all too happy to confirm.”¶ Kyl credits Senate Republicans with how they have handled the tricky politics of immigration reform. “They did it right this time, and we did it wrong,’’ he said. “We didn’t develop support among conservative media leaders in the way that [Florida Senator Marco] Rubio did. We also went straight to the floor of the Senate, not through the committee process. Going through the semblance of regular order makes it harder to oppose.”

#### CIR won’t pass, any momentum gained by the senate will waste away over the August recess

Will 7/5 (George, 7/7/2013, “Immigration Bill Momentum Slowing”,http://articles.courant.com/2013-07-05/news/hc-op-will-immigration-bill-momentum-slowing-0708-20130707\_1\_senate-republicans-house-republicans-border-security, 7/9/2013, PB)

Whatever momentum the Senate imparted to reform is a wasting asset. The House is unlikely to complete its immigration legislation before the August recess, when Republican members will return to their districts, about which The Wall Street Journal says: Only 38 of 234 House Republicans — 16 percent — represent districts that are at least 20 percent Hispanic. And "only 28 Republican-held districts are considered even remotely at risk of being contested by a Democratic challenger." Democrats will not accept a bill that does not provide a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants, and in a recent poll almost half of Republicans said they were less likely to support a legislator who supports a pathway.

#### CIR won’t pass, the Republicans’ constituents don’t like it, so they will vote it down to be reelected

Crow 7/7 (J.D., July 7, 2013, “Senate immigration reform bill will be chewed up and spit out in the House “, <http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2013/07/immigration_reform_heads_to_th.html>, 7/8/2013, PB)

"The House is not going to take up and vote on whatever the Senate passes," House Speaker John Boehner said, his face a-glow from the political heat he anticipates in the battle ahead. ¶ From the linked al.com story: 'At its core, the bill includes numerous steps to prevent future illegal immigration, while at the same time it offers a chance at citizenship to the 11 million immigrants now living in the country unlawfully. Sen. Shelby called it "the mother of all amnesties." ' ¶ Many House Republicans represent red states like Alabama, where folks read 'path to citizenship' and hear 'amnesty for criminals.' The idea that sells here: Make the border harder to cross and life harder to live for those that come here illegally.

#### CIR won’t pass, even if Republican’s support it, they won’t pass it because they care about reelection

Waldman, 7/1 (Paul, July 1, 2013, “The Cruel Math of Immigration Reform in the House”, <http://prospect.org/article/cruel-math-immigration-reform-house>, 7/8/2013, PB)

But in practice, they frequently face times when they can support something they believe is a good idea for one reason or another, but carries some risk. As comprehensive immigration reform is being considered in the House, each member is going to weighing questions like the following: How much good do I think this bill is going to do? How many votes will supporting it cost me? How hard will it be to convince the constituents who didn't like my support for it to vote for me anyway? Is it going to make fundraising easier or harder? Is the bill going to face a tight vote, so my choice will make a difference? Is my party leadership offering me something to vote the way they want, or threatening to punish me if I don't? And way, way down the list is: How will the outcome of this vote affect my party's long-term prospects in presidential elections?

#### Concerns about increased immigration include assimilation issues as well as an overall increase in illegal immigration

Ponnuru 7/15/13 (Ramesh, “A Subnation of Immigrants - Social cohesion matters” National Review July 15, 2013 LOAD-DATE: June 28, 2013, l/n)

For some people, the debate over the immigration bill before the Senate ended on June 18. That day, the Congressional Budget Office released two reports, one suggesting that the bill would increase economic growth in the U.S. and the other suggesting it would reduce the deficit over the next two decades.¶ Jonathan Tobin, writing for the website of the conservative magazine Commentary, argued that the reports showed that economic issues did not really supply a motive for opponents of the bill. Many of them really believe that a new large wave of legal immigration would be bad for the country, a sentiment Tobin found "neither defensible nor logical."¶ He continued: "Let's be honest, if you are scared by the idea of a large number of immigrants coming to this country in the future, even if the vast majority of them are arriving legally, then it's time to admit that this dispute isn't about the rule of law or amnesty, but something else [that] isn't nearly as attractive." ¶ The liberal writer Ezra Klein took a more restrained version of this view at the Washington Post's website: "Ultimately, the CBO report rips a layer of artifice from the immigration debate. Few critics of immigration reform really base their opposition on concerns about the deficit or the economy. Their real concern with immigration is cultural and sociological. But that's dangerous political ground."¶ Both of these men are right, I think, to say that much of the opposition to the legislation is cultural rather than economic. It is correct as well that some objections to increasing legal immigration are indefensible, such as objections based on the race of newcomers. But the suggestion -- explicit in Tobin, implicit in Klein -- that cultural concerns about immigration are necessarily disreputable or suspect is mistaken. It is entirely rational to hold them.¶ Which doesn't mean that the economic and rule-of-law concerns about the immigration bill can be dismissed. The CBO does not tell us what we would want to know to do a full evaluation of the bill's economics. It says that in 20 years, per capita gross national product would be 0.2 percent higher if the bill passed than it would be otherwise (a number in line with earlier studies).¶ It says that downward pressure on wages would be concentrated at the top and bottom of the wage scale. But it does not break down the numbers so that we can see the impact on people who are already living here, rather than on aggregates that include newcomers. What would the bill mean for native-born Americans working low-wage jobs? What would it mean for legal immigrants already here in 2013 in the same position? The CBO does not answer those questions.¶ The deficit estimates are constructed in a way that largely leaves out the biggest federal programs. The CBO is surely right that granting legal status to illegal immigrants here, and admitting new legal immigrants, would generate added revenue in payroll taxes for Social Security and Medicare. It is also true that many of these people would start drawing benefits from these programs after the 20-year period the CBO considered. These are redistributive programs, and the CBO estimates that most of the newcomers would be on the low end of the income distribution. It stands to reason that their lifetime impact on the federal budget would be negative.¶ Further, the bill restricts some government benefits for the illegal immigrants it grants legal status. The CBO assumes -- as it must, given the directions under which it is operating -- that these restrictions will hold. One might reasonably think, however, that they will prove unsustainable politically and that the projections even for the next 20 years are therefore too rosy.¶ But there is more to a nation than its GNP, or its federal budget. The CBO seems to be assuming that roughly 20 million immigrants would come to this country over the next decade if the bill passed, while 10 million would come if it did not. So during the next decade we would see about twice the level of immigration (legal and illegal) that we have had over the last decade. That very high level of immigration would have effects on our culture and our politics as well as on our economy and budget, and we should neither rule these out of the discussion nor, what amounts to the same thing, assume that they will all be good.¶ My own chief concern about this legislation is its effect on assimilation. Will the bill make it more or less likely that newcomers to this country will be able to be full participants in American life? That is, will they not only succeed economically but become part of our common culture even as their contributions change it? Will natives and newcomers alike, whatever their ethnic background or income, see themselves as having common interests and a common identity as citizens of the United States?¶ It is entirely reasonable to worry that doubling the inflow of immigrants will make it harder for them to assimilate, especially if a large proportion of them come from the same place. The question this legislation raises is one of national character, and no CBO report can answer it. We should want that character to be welcoming, as proponents of the legislation say. But we should not want it to be indiscriminately welcoming. And while we should want it to be pluralistic, as they also say, we should want our pluralism to be compatible with social cohesion.¶ Nothing illustrates the way the legislation corrodes these ideals more than the guest-worker programs it includes. The bill would create a large class of people who are in our society but not of it: who provide their labor but are not expected to participate in our politics or culture. Some of these "temporary" workers would renew their terms of residency so that they stayed here for years. Others would overstay their visas and become illegal immigrants, and thus hard to assimilate. Some would apply for permanent legal status and thus add to the number of low-skilled legal immigrants the bill lets in. None of these outcomes would do a great deal to advance our country's interest in assimilation.¶ The view that legal-immigration levels might be too high has generally been treated as illegitimate in our political debates. When Senator Jeff Sessions (R., Ala.) offered an amendment capping that level at 33 million over the next decade, it was defeated 17-1 in committee. This concern is not, however, confined to the margins of society. The question is rarely polled -- itself an indicator of the state of the debate -- but Fox News found in April that 55 percent of the public wanted to reduce the number of legal immigrants we admit while only 28 percent wanted to increase it. The same month, a CBS/New York Times poll had 35 percent favoring the status quo, 31 percent wanting less immigration, and 25 percent preferring more. In each of these polls, more immigration was the least popular choice. On this question, at least, it's the supporters of the bill who appear to be out of step with a large majority of the public.¶ I cannot prove it, the survey data being so scant, but I suspect that behind the public's lack of enthusiasm for increased legal immigration are the sort of cultural considerations that I've raised here but are rarely articulated in the public debate. One reason the public debate is so far removed from public opinion must be the tendency to cast these perfectly sensible considerations out of polite discussion. That tendency, it seems to me, is both unhealthy and, well, unattractive.¶ The bill provides some real benefits. Legalizing illegal immigrants would give them and their families a shot at a better life. The additional immigrants the bill would bring to our country would also experience gains: Participation in the U.S. labor market is one of the world's great treasures. Over the next few decades, they should also reduce the deficit somewhat. Native-born Americans will probably, in aggregate, see their wages go up by a small amount.¶ The additional immigration, however, seems likely to have bad effects on the wages and assimilation of the immigrants who are already here and the ones we would let in without the bill. Our country would probably be less cohesive and more divided. The continuation of illegal immigration -- the CBO estimates that if the bill passes, it will be higher in the next decade than it was in the last one, though 25 percent lower than it would be without passage -- would mean that the main problem the immigration bill was meant to address would not look any better. Demands for a new amnesty, and reduced respect for the rule of law, would be highly likely in this scenario.¶ My fears may be overstated. Perhaps people will not come to the country in anything like the numbers that the CBO assumes. Or perhaps the country's assimilative power will prove greater than I assume. The view that the risks are larger than the likely benefits, though, seems to be logical and defensible -- and right.

### 1ar – no pass – citizenship

#### Republicans are split on path to citizenship

Cowan and Ferraro 7-10 (Richard, Washington correspondent for Reuters since 2001, Thomas, journalist for Rueters since 1998, “No consensus at House Republican meeting on path to citizenship,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/07/10/us-usa-immigration-house-idUSBRE96910X20130710, ME”)

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - No consensus was reached on a possible pathway to U.S. citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants at a meeting on Wednesday of Republican members of the U.S. House of Representatives, lawmakers said.¶ "We have a disagreement inside here," said Republican Representative Steve King, estimating that members were split "50-50" on any legalization for the undocumented immigrants, a key issue in any comprehensive immigration reform.¶ (Reporting by Richard Cowan and Thomas Ferraro; Editing by David Brunnstrom)

#### Democrats won’t pass a bill without a path to citizenship

Fabian 7-9 (Jordan, editor for ABC News-Univision, “House Democrats: Path to Citizenship or Bust,” http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/Politics/house-democrats-path-citizenship-immigration-bill-bust/story?id=19617347#.Ud3-Gj54ZBl, ME)

House Democrats made it clear on Tuesday that they won't support any major immigration overhaul that does not include a pathway to citizenship.¶ Party members in the lower chamber this morning huddled with the four Democrats on the so-called "Gang of Eight" that helped write the Senate's bill. After the meeting, House Democrats said that the path to citizenship is the one thing they won't sacrifice for votes on an immigration package.¶ "You must include a pathway to citizenship," Rep. Xavier Becerra (Calif.), the chairman of the House Democratic caucus, told reporters after the meeting. "Democrats will make that very clear to Republicans

**More ev – GOP opposition to citizenship ensures the deal falls apart**

**Reuters 5/25**/13 (“Immigration Reform Faces Challenge In House Of Representatives”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/26/immigraton-reform_n_3339211.html>, CMR)

WASHINGTON, May 25 (Reuters) - The biggest proposed overhaul of U.S. **immigration** laws in a generation won bipartisan approval from a powerful Senate committee last week, but **there is a strong chance that Republicans in the House** of Representatives **will end up killing it**.¶ The problem: **House Republicans are far from convinced by arguments from party leaders that passage of the bill would help Republicans draw support from Hispanic voters**. **Many also believe** any kind of **amnesty** for the estimated 11 million immigrants who are in the United States illegally **is just plain wrong**.¶ "There is no evidence to support this idea that Republicans will pick up a lot of votes if we give amnesty to 11 million folks," said Representative Tim Huelskamp, a Kansas Republican.¶ **One possibility is that the House will vote for watered-down reform**, including more visas for highly skilled workers. But **it likely will not include** a way for the undocumented to stay legally and eventually get on a special pathway to U.S. **citizenship**.¶ **Senate Democrats and even some Senate Republicans say there is no way a comprehensive immigration bill could win final congressional approval without a pathway to citizenship**.¶ "**It's a non-starter**," **said** Democratic Senator Charles **Schumer** of New York, a member of the Gang of Eight senators who wrote the bipartisan Senate bill.¶ Some House Republican lawmakers say that even if the party would gain votes by supporting sweeping reform, that's no reason to back otherwise objectionable legislation.¶ "I don't think we should be worried about the political impact but instead what is in the best interest of America," said Republican Representative Mo Brooks of Alabama.¶ Besides, he said, "People who are going to break our laws, I don't want them in this country."¶ This kind of **opposition from House Republicans may pose the biggest threat** **to White House-backed legislation** set to come next month before the full Senate, which Obama's Democrats hold, 55-45.

### 1ar – no pass – obama pc

#### Due to Obama’s lack of political capital, it will be more difficult for him to push immigration reform into passing.

Kenny, 2013 (7/8) (John, political science major and has completed his history minor at Boston College from Lindenhurst, Long Island, “Immigration reform is treacherous waters for both parties” The Gavel Online, http://bcgavel.com/2013/07/08/opinion-immigration-reform-is-treacherous-waters-for-both-parties/, LL)

Barack Obama won re-election in 2012 in part because he was able to secure roughly 71% of the Hispanic vote. As America’s fastest growing minority, currently comprising 10 percent of the population, Hispanics proved this past election that they have become a crucial demographic in the electorate.¶ I believe that Obama was able to garner the Hispanic vote for two reasons. One, the Democrats because he pledged on their election platform to work on immigration reform. But perhaps more importantly, the Republicans did not do themselves any favors with the Hispanic community. In fact, even Obama was quoted as saying in an off-the-record interview that, “Should I win a second term, a big reason I will win a second term is because the Republican nominee and the Republican Party have so alienated the fastest-growing demographic group in the country, the Latino community.”¶ So perhaps in gratitude for his overwhelming Hispanic support in the election, Obama has made immigration reform a top priority. For the most part, he has gotten all the Democrats behind him in the effort. Even some Republicans, such as John McCain, Lindsey Graham, and Marco Rubio have worked with Democrats to make such reform a reality. However, I have numerous misgivings with the prioritization of immigration over other more pressing issues, the proposed path to citizenship within the reform itself, and the political implications of such a piece of legislation down the road.¶ Let’s first address the timing of the push for immigration reform. Of course I can understand that Obama wants to capitalize on the wave of Hispanic support in the immediate wake of his electoral victory and reward this ever-growing part of his base, but even with some Republicans joining the reform effort, Hispanics are not going to abandon the Democratic Party in droves if an immigration bill doesn’t pass in the near future.¶ However, it is only the first year of Obama’s second term. Focusing on immigration right now, so soon after the election, is premature and feels more like blatant political pandering to only one part of his base than anything else. Granted, we need immigration reform and some sort of legislation should be passed by the time Obama finishes his second term. But considering that there are greater problems facing the country, it seems to me that Obama’s policy priorities are misplaced and he is ignoring the needs of ordinary Americans. This is a distraction that can only benefit the GOP.¶ Instead of starting off his second term by trying to solve the divisive immigration issue right off the bat, Obama should first introduce progressive economic policies that have widespread support from the American people and address the country’s pressing economic woes. Passing bills to increase jobs,closing tax loopholes on outsourcing jobs overseas, and boosting exports to reduce America’s massive trade deficits are all measures that should have a much higher priority for Obama and the Democrats than they do now.¶ Obama should also fight to preserve Social Security and Medicare in their current forms indefinitely by eliminating the payroll tax cap, rather than proposing compromises to uncompromising Congressional Republicans. Creating jobs and protecting popular earned benefits programs are sound policies that will generate considerable goodwill for the Democrats at the polls, because they tangibly benefit the greatest number of the American people by helping the struggling middle class and combating the widening income inequality gap. In addition, this utilitarian approach will give the Democrats more than enough political capital to tackle immigration reform later in Obama’s second term.¶ Now, onto the merits of the proposed immigration reform itself: the main sticking point is the path to citizenship for the roughly 11 million illegal immigrants in the US. The “Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013” was formulated by the bipartisan “Gang of Eight” and was passed by the Senate on June 27. The bill is now headed to the House for approval.¶ However, the GOP-dominated House does not want a possible path to citizenship in any immigration reform bill. Senator Chuck Schumer has stated that no Democrat will vote for the bill without a path to citizenship.¶ Here, I believe that both sides have to compromise, as the two positions are in direct conflict with one another. Boston College’s very own Peter Skerry, political science professor and immigration policy expert, offers a solution that I happen to agree with. He proposes that illegal immigrants who came here as adults, with no criminal record, should be given a path to permanent residency rather than citizenship. However, children of illegal immigrants who were not born in America, and adults who came here as children, should be afforded the opportunity of citizenship. This is fair, as children cannot be held accountable for the decisions made by their parents.¶ Indeed, Skerry’s plan could prove to be popular with the American people. According to the Pew Hispanic Center, 65% of all voters, and 77% of Hispanic voters, support a path to legal status (read: not necessarily citizenship). This puts illegal immigrants with no criminal record, and their children, into the system and free from harassment or the threat of deportation. Ultimately, I think that Schumer and the rest of the “Gang of Eight” should, and are going to, make this compromise with the House.¶ Also, Nancy Pelosi has essentially said that if Republicans want to win the White House ever again, they need to pass the bill. I find this to be an inaccurate assessment of the state of the Republican Party. As of now, social conservatism is what is dragging the GOP down, not immigration. I foresee the GOP either forsaking social conservatism in the not-too-distant future, thus ensuring the survival of the party, or a schism of the party that will see social conservatism die a slow death.¶ Due to this schism that I foresee, the GOP is caught between a rock and a hard place on immigration reform. Being perceived as too lenient on illegal immigrants will not go over well with much of their existing base. But at the same time, what do they have to lose? In the past twenty years, the Republicans have only won two out of six presidential elections, with one out of those two wins merely a technicality thanks to the 2000 Florida fiasco. So, immigration reform could work in the GOP’s favor, if the bill is passed in a broadly bipartisan effort, with or without compromise.¶ I also don’t think Pelosi should be giving the Republicans any hints on how to win the White House. Rather, shouldn’t she should want the bill to pass with only the least amount of Republican support needed? Like I mentioned earlier, if the bill passes with broad bipartisan support, it could potentially cut into Hispanic support of the Democrats. But if only the bare minimum of Republicans join the Democrats in passing the bill, especially if the Skerry compromise is made, then the Democrats essentially have Hispanic support locked up for good, and can successfully paint the GOP as being backwards and intolerant. So it is in the best interests of the Democrats to only get the votes from the other side of the aisle that they need for it to pass, and move on.¶ Ultimately, I see the immigration bill eventually passing, with Skerry’s compromises. But there will be huge ripple effects of the legislation down the road. If the Republicans broadly support immigration reform, they will benefit more politically than the Democrats will. Considering the timing of such a bill in the absence of any broad economic initiatives so far in Obama’s second term, I see the Democrats as taking an unnecessary political risk and could potentially alienate many of the middle to working class, blue-collar whites that are still a vital part of their electoral coalition.¶ The winds of public opinion are clearly blowing in favor of the Democrats, as they are more socially liberal than their Republican counterparts. In this day and age, it has become almost taboo in society to be a hardline social conservative. As such, the battles over social issues that we have seen extensively in the past decade will diminish.¶ This means that the debates in the future will shift to economic issues. This is where both the Democrats and the Republicans have roughly equal support. However, with the libertarians gaining in strength amongst young voters, they will probably take over the Republican Party in the coming years. The Democrats need to steal their thunder. They need to effectively make the case for why their economic policies, which rely on growth from the middle class outwards, are better for the country than the trickle-down alternative. Then these policies need to actually be enacted and implemented, which will lead to greater prosperity for all. But the time for the Democrats to do this is now.

### 1ar – no pass – a2 senate pressure

#### House won’t budge – despite Senate pressure

Canham 7/8/13 (Matt, “The easy part of immigration reform is over”, <http://www.therepublic.com/view/story/immig-house/immig-house>, CMR)

How do you get a fractured House Republican caucus to back comprehensive immigration reform? Pressure. Lots and lots of pressure.¶ At least that's been the working theory of reform supporters, who want to package a path to citizenship with increased border security and a streamlined visa program. That group includes conservative heavyweights from Fox News' Bill O'Reilly and Karl Rove's well-funded super PAC to Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah.¶ But so far, House leaders appear far from impressed by the Senate's immigration bill, which received 68 votes, including the support of all Democrats and 14 Republicans.¶ "I couldn't careless," said Rep. Jason Chaffetz, R-Utah, who sits on two House committees Judiciary and Homeland Security that have debated immigration proposals. 'I don't know why that would affect my thinking on the issue.'¶ His reaction is hardly unique in the House, where Republicans outnumber Democrats, 234-201. The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Rep. Bob Goodlatte, held a town-hall meeting in his Lynchburg, Va., district on Tuesday, when he knocked down the perception that the House GOP will eventually buckle and support a proposal they view skeptically.¶ "We shouldn't feel pressured by the Senate, the president or anyone else,' the Virginia Republican said, according to ABC News. 'Getting it right is more important than passing a bill."¶ President Barack Obama received 71 percent of the Hispanic vote in his 2012 reelection, and some Republicans worry that the party will have a tough time reclaiming a decent share of that bloc if they come off as opposing immigration reform.¶ But what is good politics on the national level doesn't necessarily translate to winning elections back home, particularly safe House seats where an incumbent could be vulnerable to a challenge from within his or her own party.¶ "It is the definition of a difficult vote," said Kirk Jowers, director of the Hinckley Institute of Politics at the University of Utah. 'The House members are thinking, 'It is probably in my own self-interest if I vote no, but probably against my party's and my country's self-interest if I vote no."¶ With a Republican House and a Democratic Senate, Jowers sees no way to pass immigration reform that doesn't include a path to citizenship along with more enforcement measures.¶ Hatch has made the same pitch, saying the time is now to solve this problem, and there is only one practical way to do it the Senate bill.¶ But Goodlatte, Chaffetz and many House Republicans want to tackle the issue in chunks and have begun to do just that, focusing first on bills involving border security and revamping the temporary-worker program for highly skilled immigrants.¶ It's unclear if they'll debate a proposal offering legal status to the 11 million people in the U.S. illegally.¶ House Speaker John Boehner has repeatedly said he won't bring up a bill unless a majority of Republicans support it. That could be a tough threshold to reach.

#### CIR won’t pass even though the senate passed it

Miller, 7/6 (Jake, July 6, 2013, “What will the House do on immigration reform?”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57592500/what-will-the-house-do-on-immigration-reform/>, 7/8/2013, PB)

The Senate bill allocated billions of dollars in additional technology and manpower for the Border Patrol, and it required the full implementation of new border security measures before undocumented immigrants could begin traveling the path to citizenship, a proposal hailed by some conservatives who have demanded border security as a precondition of broader reform efforts.¶ Some, however, objected to the bill's immediate provision of an interim legal status to undocumented immigrants as they await their green cards and an eventual path to citizenship.¶ "The Senate bill gives amnesty first and then says let's work on border security," said Rep. Trey Radel, R-Fla., according to the Sun Sentinel. "What I would like to do is see our border secured first and then work on a different paths for the 11 million that are here and, more importantly, reform our legal immigration system."

**1ar – no pass**

#### Reform won’t pass- Obama ignoring the rule of law

Fund 7-8 (John, American political journalist and conservative columnist. “Why Obamacare Threatens Immigration Reform,” <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/352829/why-obamacare-threatens-immigration-reform-john-fund>, ME)

Chuck Todd, the political director of NBC News, startled much of Washington on Sunday morning when he announced on Meet the Press that White House aides he’s spoken to have lost confidence that immigration reform will pass. He reported that “suddenly the White House doesn’t see a path” to passing a bill through the House this year.¶ There are many reasons why immigration reform is in trouble, ranging from the fact that immigration is not currently a burning political issue to the inherent complexity and internal contradictions of a 1,200-page bill.¶ But there is another less-discussed reason. The Obama administration’s instinctive dishonesty and contempt for the rule of law are finally catching up with it. Few Republicans in the House — even those who devoutly want immigration reform — trust the Obama administration to enforce with consistency and integrity anything that passes Congress.¶ Take the 900-page monstrosity of a law that’s been dubbed “Obamacare.” When it passed back in 2010, the law was clear on many points. It decreed that beginning in 2014, any company with more than 50 full-time employees would be required to offer them health-care insurance or pay stiff fines. But it’s been impossible, in the three years since the law’s passage, to work out the Byzantine requirements of that mandate. Max Baucus (D., Mont.) said in a congressional hearing he feared that Obamacare’s implementation would result in a “train wreck,” and many other Democrats have come to share his anxiety. White House aides fretted that enforcing the mandate’s timetable would hurt job creation in the run-up to the 2014 midterm elections and put Democratic control of the Senate in jeopardy.¶ The White House could have handled the problem as the Constitution envisioned and opened up negotiations with Congress to change the law. But it quickly concluded that the Republican House would demand too much in exchange for any adjustment to the law. So instead the administration had a blog item quietly posted on the Treasury’s website just before the July Fourth holiday. Under the Orwellian headline “Continuing to Implement the ACA [Affordable Care Act] in a Careful, Thoughtful Manner,” Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy Mark Mazur announced that enforcement of the employer mandate would be delayed until 2015. A Treasury official claimed that the administration has “longstanding administrative authority to grant transition relief when implementing new legislation like the ACA.” Oh, really? Even though the law is quite clear that the mandate shall be effective as of 2014?¶ Representative Darrell Issa (R., Calif.), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform committee, says the announcement represents “policy by blog post” and that it is “another in a string of extra legal actions” that President Obama has used to evade laws and the intent of Congress. He noted earlier this year that the Obama administration was interpreting the health-care law to provide tax credits in health exchanges even if states refused to set them up.¶ “As a former constitutional-law teacher, President Obama must know that this action gets into very questionable constitutional territory,” Issa told the Capitol Hill newspaper Roll Call. “It also paves the way for future administrations to simply not enforce parts of Obamacare they don’t believe are functioning well.”¶ Rick Klein of ABC News concluded that the announcement was “a blow in every conceivable way to the Obama administration — an admission that its signature legislative accomplishment isn’t ready for prime time, just as the law’s critics have been arguing and arguing.”¶ Ultimately, the greatest damage from delaying the employer mandate may come in the way it solidifies House Republican doubts about the immigration bill. Representative Phil Roe (R., Tenn.), chairman of an Education and Workforce subcommittee, says that he doubts the administration can be trusted to enforce the will of Congress when it comes to border security or any other part of the immigration bill. “They have shown no respect for traditional Constitutional separation of powers, and that makes it difficult to pass laws where the fear is that they will simply ignore the parts they don’t like,” he tells me. The Obama administration has not hesitated to simply ignore the clear language of Obamacare. Why wouldn’t it disregard the immigration bill in the same way? In addition, the Gang of Eight bill is stuffed with instances of discretion – in other words, opportunities for administrative meddling. It includes 222 mentions of the word “may” and 153 uses of “waive.” That’s an awful lot of discretion to hand to an administration that is expert at interpreting laws creatively to suit whatever political advantage it desires.¶ In the classic 1960s free-market poem “Tom Smith and His Incredible Bread Machine,” an entrepreneur is pursued and prosecuted by an ideologically driven Justice Department on trumped-up charges. Just before he is sentenced, he asks the judge presiding over his trial what is happening to him. “The rule of law, in complex times, has proved itself deficient,” she sneers at him. “We much prefer the rule of men! It’s vastly more efficient.”¶ But our system wasn’t designed by the Founding Fathers to be efficient. Indeed, it was designed to rein in the arbitrary and capricious use of power. The growing belief that the Obama administration can’t be trusted to respect the rule of law may prove to be one of the biggest obstacles it faces in passing the immigration reform it so powerfully desires.

#### The CIR will have a difficult time passing the House because of Boehner’s adamant opposition toward the Senate’s immigration reform bill.

Levinson, 2013 (7/8) (Alexis, “Boehner reiterates House will not take up Senate immigration bill” CNN, http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/05/29/186510529/immigration-measure-faces-test-in-senate-rival-bill-in-house, LL)

WASHINGTON – The House will not vote on the Senate immigration reform bill, Speaker John Boehner reiterated for the umpteenth time on Monday.¶ “I’ve made it clear, and I’ll make it clear again: the House is not going to take up the Senate bill. The House is going to do its own job in developing an immigration bill,” Ohio Republican Boehner said at a press conference Monday afternoon.¶ The comment came in response to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid’s prediction on the floor Monday afternoon that Boehner would ultimately take up the Senate bill.¶ “Eventually he’ll be forced to take up the bill that we passed here, or the country will be left with no immigration reform at all,” Reid said, attacking Boehner for a string of “recent shortsighted failures” in getting bills passed – notably the farm bill, which unexpectedly failed.¶ The Senate passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill before leaving for Fourth of July recess that includes a path to legalization for the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants currently in the United States. It also requires increased border security, but the border security provisions fall short of what many Republicans would like.¶ On Wednesday, House Republicans will meet to discuss how they will move forward on immigration reform now that the Senate has passed a bill and the ball is in their court. The result is expected to focus far more heavily on border security.¶ “It’s real clear from everything that I’ve seen and read over the past couple weeks that the American people expect that we’ll have strong border security in place before we begin the process of legalizing and fixing our legal immigration system,” Boehner said.¶ Boehner made clear that while the House would not pass the Senate bill, he did plan to tackle the issue of immigration.¶ “We have a broken immigration system…we just can’t turn a blind eye to this problem and believe it will go away,” he said.¶ “I believe this House has a job to do, and we will do our job,” he said.

#### Immigration reform has a new worst enemy: John Boehner who will try his best to prevent the bill from passing the House.

Stevenson, 2013 (7/8) (Freeman, “Boehner's problem on immigration reform”, writer for DeseretNews.com MoneyWise section, Deseret News, http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865582791/Boehners-problem-on-immigration-reform.html, LL)

“Immigration pits the long-term interests of the party against the short-term interests of many of its House members. In the long term, the GOP needs a good share of the burgeoning Hispanic vote in order to survive. If you’re a Republican House member, however, you aren’t worrying much about the future political needs of other members of your party,” says Pitney, in effect summing up the conundrum faced by the GOP as the voting population rapidly diversifies.¶ And just because the Senate passed the bi-partisan bill with several Republican votes, that really doesn’t correlate to support from the right in the lower chamber. “Although the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration reform by 68-32, and got some Republican votes, that outcome just serves to illustrate the differences between the chambers. Senators represent entire states and are more likely to have diverse constituencies. Serving six years instead of two, they have longer time horizons.”¶ Pitney notes that while the Netflix series “House of Cards” shows just how productive a Machiavellian speaker like Kevin Spacey’s Frank Underwood can be, in the real world Boehner lacks the clout to force his party to do much of anything it doesn’t want to do. “Ironically, sincerity presents problems for congressional leaders. In Underwood’s TV world, it’s easy to buy people because everybody is for sale: even his wife’s environmental group is a scam. In reality, political motivations are a complex mix of self-interest and public interest.”¶ For Boehner, creating a bill that somehow appeases the Senate and the House is a task that will likely end up deserving its own TV series.

#### The CIR will face opposition from the house Republicans, leading to a rival bill in creation.

Welna, 2013 (7/6) (David, graduated magna cum laude from Carleton College in Northfield, MN, with a Bachelor of Arts and distinction in Latin American Studies, “Immigration Measure Faces Test In Senate, Rival Bill In House” Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2013/07/08/boehner-reiterates-house-will-not-take-up-senate-immigration-bill/, LL)

Members of Congress are back in their home states this week for a Memorial Day recess. It's a chance to talk with constituents about what could become the year's biggest legislative story: the push on Capitol Hill to fix what Democrats and Republicans alike agree is a broken immigration system.¶ A bill proposed by the Gang of Eight, a bipartisan group of senators, to revamp the nation's immigration rules passed out of committee last week and will soon be brought before the Democratic-led Senate. Less clear, though, is where the issue is headed in the GOP-controlled House.¶ A Senate Truce¶ The Senate chamber lately has become an even more partisan battlefield than usual, with verbal fights breaking out daily over stalled presidential nominations and a budget stuck in limbo. Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., is threatening to rewrite the Senate's filibuster rules to break the logjam.¶ That would infuriate the Republican minority and possibly doom any chance of bipartisan cooperation. But Reid says he's putting all that off until the Senate finishes the immigration overhaul — the one thing Democrats and Republicans do seem able to work on together.¶ "I'm going to do nothing to interfere with immigration," Reid says. "It is important for our country, and I admire the bipartisan nature of what happened with the Gang of Eight. It's exemplary of what we should do around here on everything."¶ But fierce opponents of the immigration bill's promised path to citizenship for 11 million unauthorized immigrants are preparing a series of poison-pill amendments. Leading that effort is Sen. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., whose amendments almost all failed in committee.¶ "I think they would have a considerably better chance of passing on the floor than in the Judiciary Committee," Sessions says.¶ It's All Politics¶ Fears Of Killing Immigration Bill Doomed Same-Sex Amendment¶ One amendment that had been proposed by Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., may not be brought up. It would give gay Americans the same right as everyone else to sponsor foreign-born spouses for green cards. Democrats fear it could prove as divisive in the full Senate as it did in the Judiciary Committee, where ultimately it was withheld.¶ Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., is a strong supporter of gay rights, but she says she does not want that amendment revived.¶ "I want to see an immigration bill," she says. "We will lose all kinds of Republican votes if that's in the bill."¶ The House's Will¶ Gang of Eight leader Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., says he thinks many Republicans eager to improve their party's standing with Latino voters want to back his group's bill.¶ "My hope would be we could pass the Senate bill with a large number of votes, and the House would take it up," he says.¶ But House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, insists his chamber won't simply take up and pass whatever the Senate sends over.¶ "The House is going to work its will on immigration," he says. "We're not going to be stampeded by the White House or stampeded by the president. The Senate is working its will — a lot of good work that's gone on over there — but the House will work its will. Don't ask me how because if I knew, I'd certainly tell you."¶ One option would be to consider a series of more conservative immigration measures being worked up by the House Judiciary Committee. But the House also has its own bipartisan group of eight trying to forge comprehensive immigration legislation.¶ One of its members is California's Xavier Becerra, the House's fourth-ranking Democrat.¶ "The Senate's proved that you can come up with a bipartisan deal, and I think in the House we're going to do the same thing," Becerra says. "We're going to prove that you can come up with a bipartisan deal. [It] may look a little different than the Senate."¶ That may be an understatement.¶ "It's a very different bill than the Senate bill," says Rep. Raul Labrador, R-Idaho, another member of the House's group of eight. One big difference, he notes, is how his group's yet-to-be-released proposal deals with the 11 million immigrants in the United States illegally.¶ "There is not a special pathway to citizenship, but anybody who can be legalized has an ability to become a citizen of the United States," Labrador says.¶ Looking Ahead¶ Labrador says the group has finally settled its differences and hopes to have a bill others can look at soon. But Rep. Raul Grijalva, D-Ariz., doubts such legislation would remain intact.¶ "What I'm concerned about is the amendments that'll be tacked on to any piece of legislation that comes out of the House," Grijalva says. "Not only poison pills, but things that'll derail, break it up into pieces — all as part of a stalling and delaying tactic."¶ It would be much better, Grijalva says, if the House simply took up the Senate's immigration bill. Fellow Arizonan John McCain, a Republican member of the Gang of Eight senators, agrees.¶ "I'm still optimistic we will get this through the House and Senate," McCain says.¶ Just how that would happen, though, no one can say.

**House GOP will kill reform – don’t buy the hype on Senate momentum**

**Cillizza 6/25** (Chris, and Sean Sullivan, “The Senate is going to pass immigration reform. And the House doesn’t care”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/06/25/the-senate-is-going-to-pass-immigration-reform-and-the-house-doesnt-care/>, CMR)

Two **things have become clear** over the past 24 hours: 1. **The Senate is going to pass some sort of** comprehensive **immigration reform** bill, and 2. **The House doesn’t** much **care**. Welcome to Washington, circa 2013!¶ **It’s chilly in the** U.S. **Capitol** these days.¶ “**Why should a minority of the minority in the Senate influence a majority of the majority in the House,**” asked Oklahoma Republican Rep. Tom Cole. “While most Senators aren’t up for election next year, every member of the House will be on the ballot.”¶ Rewind back a few months and the idea that a vote to proceed to debate on a key border security measure would win 67 votes — as it did Monday night — would be greeted with something between disbelief and joy by immigration reform advocates.¶ But, even before the Senate voted Monday night, it was obvious that **no matter what the vote looked like it would have little influence on the plans of the GOP**-controlled **House**.¶ House Speaker John **Boehner** (Ohio) **had told his Republican colleagues that no immigration legislation would be brought the floor if a majority of the GOP majority didn’t support it**. And, anyone who has spent any time around the current Republican majority in the House — or watched as the farm bill failed last week – recognizes that **the Senate immigration bill** (and, perhaps, any bipartisan immigration bill) **isn’t going to be backed by a majority of the Republican majority in that chamber**.¶ How the Senate voted on Monday also affirms that **the immigration legislation could** well **be dead on arrival in the House. Not a single member of the Senate GOP leadership voted for cloture**. All told, **27 Republicans voted against it while 15 voted in favor of the cloture motion**. (Four GOP Senators did not vote, largely due to bad weather in and around Washington Monday that delayed flights.) **Those numbers provide little of the momentum or pressure that some Republicans had hoped might be foist upon the House with a strong Senate GOP vote for the bill.**¶“**It doesn’t matter at all,**” said one senior GOP House leadership aide about the Senate vote on immigration. “It wouldn’t be something a Republican Senate would bring to the floor. Why should a Republican House just take it up?”¶ Added another House Republican leadership staffer: “**Even if the bill passes with 70-plus votes in the Senate, the path to 218 in the House is very perilous. Many Republicans are skeptical of even voting on something as simple as border security,** as they feel that it provides a ‘path to Conference [committee]‘ where they are afraid an untenable compromise will emerge.”¶ During the “fiscal cliff” debate, the Senate passed a bipartisan measure with 89 votes over the opposition of only five Republicans. But over in the House, less than 40 percent of Republicans supported it, reinforcing the reality that nothing in the Senate guarantees passage in the lower chamber.¶ What Republicans in the House want, according to Cole, is a chance to pass their own bill through the normal legislative order and then try to negotiate a compromise between their version and what passes the Senate. “If that cannot be done then no bill should or will pass the House,” he said.¶ Now, it’s important to remember that the Senate vote on Monday night was simply to move ahead on one proposed part of a larger package. But it was a significant step toward a final vote on passage before Congress breaks around July 4.¶ It’s possible that votes in the Senate could shift between Monday and the final vote on the measure. (Of course, it would be strange if any of the 27 Republicans who opposed cloture then turned around and voted for the legislation.) And, it’s also possible that the House GOP leadership will change its approach between now and then.¶ Neither scenario seems likely, however. Which means that **immigration reform** — at least at the moment — **looks to be** teetering **on the edge of failure.**

**Lack of border security makes the bill “dead on arrival” in the House**

**CBS 6/23** (“Immigration reform foes count on House to kill the bill”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57590626/immigration-reform-foes-count-on-house-to-kill-the-bill/>, CMR)

In light of that amendment, foes of the comprehensive bill admitted, **the bill is likely to pass the Senate, but it may yet falter in the House.**¶ "**It will pass the Senate, but it's dead on arrival in the House**," **said** Sen. Rand **Paul**, R-Ky., on CNN's "State of the Union."¶ Paul said, while he's "all in favor" of immigration reform, **the "border surge" unveiled this week would not guarantee border security because it does not provide Congress an opportunity to verify its implementation.**¶ "I think **reform should be dependent on border security first**," he said. "Without some Congressional authority and without border security first, I can't support the final bill... To me, what really tells me that they're serious would be letting Congress vote on whether the border is secure."¶ "**The House is much closer to me," he added**.

**More ev – House GOP will block reform without improved border security**

**CBS 6/23** (“Immigration reform foes count on House to kill the bill”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57590626/immigration-reform-foes-count-on-house-to-kill-the-bill/>, CMR)

**Deriding the "border surge" as a "provision few people have read and ever fewer understand," Lee argued, "We have to look to the fact that the pathway to citizenship begins basically on day one, but it will take many, many years, if not decades, to fully implement all these border security measures**."¶ And **that may be a problem when the bill reaches House Republicans**. "**The House** of Representatives **has said border security first,**" Lee said. "They are doing exactly the right thing."

**Won’t pass – border security still too weak to secure House support**

**Walsh 6/25** (Alex, Immigration reform 'dead on arrival' in House, Sen. Paul says, despite border security amendment success, <http://blog.al.com/wire/2013/06/immigration_reform_dead_on_arr.html>, CMR)

**The Senate added stronger border security** to its existing immigration reform bill Monday, passing an amendment to that effect with broad support. **But at least one senator remains convinced that reform will not make it out of the House.**¶ The border security amendment adds $30 billion in spending, The Hill's Alexander Bolton notes. The money would be used to double the number of border patrol agents to 40,000, and add 700 miles of fence along the U.S.-Mexico border.¶ The amendment was approved by a strong vote, with 67 senators voting in favor, against just 27 nays. (Two Democrats weren't present, so the vote may have been even stronger later in the week.)¶ **Despite that supportive signal**, however, U.S. Sen. Rand **Paul**, R-Ky., **does not see a future for immigration reform in the lower chamber of Congress.**¶ “**It’s dead on arrival in the House**,” Paul recently told Fox News. “The House is much closer to me.”

**Won’t pass House or Senate – GOP opposition – neg authors exaggerate**

**Olson 6/11**/13 (David, “IMMIGRATION REFORM: Tough road ahead in House”, http://blog.pe.com/2013/06/11/immigration-reform-tough-road-ahead-in-house/)

**The Senate voted to advance** the bipartisan **immigration**-reform bill today.¶ **But the 82-15 vote margin is misleading**. Some senators who voted to move the bill forward likely will vote against it.¶ Sen. John **Cornyn** of Texas **voted “yes”** on Tuesday **but said, “The bill grants permanent legal status** to millions of undocumented immigrants, as currently written, **without really any guarantee of securing the border.** Now, how would that possibly be a good idea?”¶ **Some** immigrant-rights groups **have argued** that **the border-security measures are too stringent**. They particularly object to tying the achievement of border-security goals to allowing undocumented immigrants to apply for legal residency and, later, citizenship.¶ But **one of the bill’s key sponsors**, Florida Republican Sen. Marco Rubio, **has said the border-security measures will need to be even stricter to gain more Republican support**. President Obama Tuesday called for the passage of a bill.¶ “This bill isn’t perfect; it’s a compromise,” Obama said. “Going forward, nobody is going to get everything they want. Not Democrats, not Republicans, not me.”¶ The Democratic-controlled Senate is expected to approve the measure. But **getting a bill** with a path to citizenship **through the** **Republican**-controlled **House may be an uphill battle**.¶ **Last week, the House voted along party lines to end an Obama** administration **program that provides temporary legalization for many young undocumented immigrants** who came to the United States as children.¶ All Inland Republicans voted for the measure, including Rep. Gary Miller, who according to the closely-watched Cook Political Report is the most endangered GOP incumbent in the country in the 2014 elections. Miller’s district is majority Latino and Asian-American and voted by a 16-point margin for President Obama in the 2012 election.¶ Protections for young undocumented immigrants are among the most popular parts of immigration-reform proposals, and a vote for the measure by a vulnerable Republican such as Miller is a sign of how difficult it may be to get Republican House votes for a measure that provides a path to citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants of all ages. Miller’s office hasn’t responded to my requests for comment.¶ **Even though the political muscle that Latinos demonstrated in the November election is probably the biggest reason why members of Congress scrambled to introduce** a comprehensive **immigration**-reform proposal, remember that **members of the House care most about their districts** – **not** **the political dynamics in national elections.**¶ I’ve chatted several times over the past few months with Roy Beck, the executive director of NumbersUSA, which supports more restrictions on immigration. People across the political spectrum have credited the grass-roots group with helping defeat a 2007 immigration overhaul that also had a path to citizenship.¶ Beck argues that **the bill will fail in the House** in large part **because the vast majority of Republican districts are safe GOP bastions with a small percentage of Latino voters**.¶ NumbersUSA members – the group says it now has two million – flooded Capitol Hill with phone calls, faxes, emails and letters in 2007 and are being urged to do so again this year.¶ Time will tell how effective the campaign by groups such as NumbersUSA against a path to citizenship will be. But **there seems to be little doubt that getting** **such a bill through the House will be a tough battle** that will have consequences in the 2014 elections and beyond.

**Won’t pass – House-Senate differences prevent final compromise**

**Ferrechio 5/27**/13 (Susan, Chief Congressional Correspondent, “House, Senate nearing showdown over immigration reform”, <http://washingtonexaminer.com/house-senate-nearing-showdown-over-immigration-reform/article/2530506?custom_click=rss>, CMR)

But **even as the House and Senate advance their own versions of the bill, differences between them could ultimately sink the chances for a final compromise.**¶ **House Republicans oppose the path to citizenship and immediate legalization the Senate bill would provide**. And **Smith called the Senate version "fatally flawed**," in part **because it lacks adequate border security provisions**.¶ **Boehner** **announced** last week **the House "will not simply take up and accept the bill that is emerging in the Senate if it passes**."¶ **The Senate is working on a single comprehensive bill** that would deal with legalization, border security and other issues. **That could be problematic in the House, where** House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob **Goodlatte**, R-Va., **has been parsing the issue into a series of bills more limited in scope**. The House approach allows lawmakers to vote separately on various aspects of reform so they can support some and oppose others.¶ Goodlatte last week introduced a bill that would increase visas for high-skilled workers and provide green cards to foreign graduates of U.S. universities who have earned degrees in science, technology and engineering.¶ Goodlatte told The Washington Examiner that he will introduce a bill next week that would bolster enforcement of existing immigration laws.¶ "**Step by step**," Goodlatte said, describing his approach. "**There are lots of problems with the Senate bill**."

**Won’t pass – House GOP opposition to citizenship**

**Sargent 5/28**/13 (Greg, “House GOP could still kill immigration reform”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/05/28/will-house-gop-kill-immigration-reform/>, CMR)

In a sign that **immigration reform still faces steep odds in the House**, Reuters reports that **a significant number of House Republicans are still not convinced that an immigration bill would help GOP outreach to Latino voters**. Reuters quotes one representative, Tim Huelskamp of Kansas, capturing the mood of many of his colleagues this way: “There is no evidence to support this idea that Republicans will pick up a lot of votes if we give amnesty to 11 million folks.”¶ Meanwhile, Rep. Mo Brooks of Alabama sees “amnesty” as a slippery slope. “We can’t afford to give amnesty to every person who wants to illegally cross our borders,” he said. “We don’t have enough money in our piggy bank. Amnesty begets more amnesty.”¶ In other words, now that the bipartisan Senate gang of eight’s immigration reform compromise has cleared the Judiciary Committee and made its way to the Senate floor, making it more likely that it will pass the Senate, **there’s** still **the very real possibility that reform will die in the House** of Representatives. There, **the numbers are not in their favor**. **House Republicans have long voiced their opposition to a comprehensive bill.**¶That the immigration bill has a long and difficult path to citizenship — thirteen years, with a sizable list of fees and requirements — doesn’t factor into this opposition. **The mere fact that some unauthorized immigrants could receive citizenship** at some point in the future **is enough to inspire opposition**. And among **House Republicans**, this **opposition is fairly broad-based**; as we saw with the fights over the debt ceiling, the fiscal cliff, and the sequester, **Tea Party Republicans have a tight grip on the direction of the chamber.**¶ If House Republicans can be convinced of the need for a path to citizenship, then there’s hope for the bill. Otherwise, prospects are dire. **Supporters of c**omprehensive **i**mmigration **r**eform **won’t settle for anything less than a path to citizenship**. And as the above quotes suggest, **House Republicans are not persuaded that passing reform will necessarily be good for the GOP**.

**Border security and lack of GOP support**

**Zornick 6/13**/13 (George, “House GOP Revolt Against Immigration Reform Begins”, http://www.thenation.com/blog/174787/house-gop-revolt-against-immigration-reform-begins#axzz2WG9NejUi)

The headline-grabbing debate over immigration reform is happening in **the Senate** this week, as the entire body debates a series of amendments to the comprehensive legislation passed by the Senate Judiciary Committee last month. **There is a very real chance** that **reform could die there**—**if**, for example, Senator John **Cornyn’s border security amendment passes, the bill might become unsupportable for many Democrats**.¶ But **lurking in the background is an even more difficult fight in the House**, **where the Republican caucus is much more hostile to reform.** **House members are beholden to smaller, more conservative districts, and there are no leaders calling for reform analogous to** Republicans Marco **Rubio and** John **McCain in the Senate.**¶ This week began with some promising signs from the office of House Speaker John Boehner. For months, he said virtually nothing about his strategy for passing immigration reform—not even whether one existed—but Politico reported Monday that “privately, the Ohio Republican is beginning to sketch out a road map to try to pass some version of an overhaul in his chamber.” The next morning, during an ABC News interview, Boehner hinted that he might allow an immigration bill to pass the House with a majority of Democratic votes, thereby abandoning the so-called “Hastert rule.”¶ Without question, that was tremendous news for proponents of immigration reform. But don’t think conservatives opposed to any legislation didn’t notice—and **the first unified effort by anti-immigration House members might have now begun.**¶ Thursday morning, Glenn Beck’s website The Blaze had the exclusive news that **seventy members of the House GOP “are planning a politically risky showdown” with Boehner**. Led by Representatives Steve King, Michele Bachmann and Louie Gohmert, the group is demanding two things from Boehner: (1) a special Republican conference meeting about immigration, and (2) a promise to be true to the Hastert Rule.¶ **The caucus meeting could be perilous for Boehner**—his strategy of keeping the House at a very low temperature and mollifying, at least for now, the hardline anti-immigration members couldn’t survive a head-to-head confrontation. Boehner would have to address their Hastert rule request directly. (Note, too, that conservative activists also began pressuring Boehner on the Hastert rule this week—the heads of the Club for Growth, Heritage Action, the American Conservative Union and the Family Research Council sent Boehner a letter on Tuesday demanding he never stray from the Hastert rule again.)

**Border security is a poison pill – collapses reform**

**Frates 6/14** (Chris, “GOP Not Backing Down on Border Security in Immigration Bill”, <http://www.govexec.com/defense/2013/06/gop-not-backing-down-border-security-immigration-bill/64883/>)

Despite publicly rallying around an aggressive plan from Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, to secure the border, Republicans are privately conceding that staunch Democratic opposition means it likely doesn’t have the votes to pass.¶ But that doesn’t mean the issue goes down too.¶ **Conservatives still want border-security improvements and are warning Democrats that not getting them could jeopardize the immigration-reform bill**. **At the very least**, they argue, **it means Democrats won’t come near the 70 votes some Democrats are both predicting and banking on to force the House into action on immigration.**¶ GOP Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida, a supporter of Cornyn’s amendment and key architect of the immigration bill, articulated the Republican position best. Asked Wednesday by Sean Hannity if he would oppose the bill if it did not completely secure the border, Rubio hedged, saying, “The thing I’m trying to avoid is all that ultimatum language because I think that undermines what we’re trying to do.”¶ “**If the border-security elements of this bill are not in place, we’re wasting our time**. **This bill’s not going to pass,**” he said. “If that doesn’t get in the bill I’m going to keep working to get it in.”¶ Already Rubio is working on his own border-security proposal that could sate some of the conservative appetite for tougher border controls. And other Republican senators are huddling behind closed doors to discuss how to tighten up the border.¶ Even Democrats acknowledge something will likely be added to the bill. “But it won’t be from Cornyn,” a senior Democratic leadership aide said.¶ Democrats went after **Cornyn’s proposal**—the first border-security amendment to surface during the debate—fast and hard. Democratic Senate Majority Leader Harry **Reid called it a “poison pill**,” and Sen. Chuck Schumer’s camp essentially called Cornyn a liar for saying that he and the New York Democrat had discussed his amendment.¶ Simply put, Democrats think **Cornyn’s amendment is a pretext to oppose the bill**, not an attempt to improve it.¶ And they aren’t altogether wrong.¶ If Cornyn’s amendment dies, “that’s all the cover conservatives in border states need to vote against the bill,” said a senior GOP Senate aide.¶ For his part, Cornyn told his colleagues in a closed-door meeting earlier this week that he’d vote for the immigration bill if his changes were approved.¶ **Republicans are** also **playing** a bit of **longball in the face of Democratic reluctance to move the Senate legislation too far to the right**—something Cornyn hinted at Wednesday. “My hope would be that we can improve the bill before it goes over to the House, because as you know, ultimately the endgame here is going to be a House-Senate conference committee that will produce the final outcome.”

**Border security and citizenship ensure “poison pill” amendments that collapse support**

**Nakamura 6/12**/13 (David, “Obama returns focus to immigration”, http://www.journalgazette.net/article/20130612/NEWS03/306129977/1066)

**Critics pushed back quickly** as the Senate began debating the legislation. Sen. Ted **Cruz**, R-Texas, **said** that **while he expected the legislation to pass the Senate, it would fail in the House unless proponents agreed to additional border security** measures **and backed off** a guaranteed path to **citizenship** for illegal immigrants.¶ “The path to **citizenship is the** single **most divisive issue**,” Cruz said.¶ “**It’s an issue** that the **Obama** White House **and Senate Democrats are insisting on**, and by insisting on that, I believe **they have designed a bill that is destined to be voted down**,” he added.¶ As Obama spoke at the White House, Sen. John **Cornyn**, R-Texas, **laid out his proposal to require 100 percent border security** before any undocumented **immigrants are eligible for legal status**.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid or Nevada and other **Democrats have described Cornyn’s proposal as a “poison pill” amendment** **that would unravel the bipartisan alliance**.

**Amendment process will derail reform**

**Dinan 6/11**/13 (Stephen, “Poison pills enter bruising Senate battle over immigration reform”, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jun/11/senate-heads-immigration-filibuster/?page=all#pagebreak)

Senators headed off a filibuster Tuesday and officially brought the immigration reform bill to the chamber floor, marking the first time since 2007 that the full, thorny issue has been back in front of Congress — and with lawmakers anticipating plenty of hurdles ahead.¶ **Within the first two hours, lawmakers had filed 44 amendments** to the 1,075-page bill. **Among those proposed changes are potential poison pills to grant immigration benefits to** American citizens’ **gay partners, and to make illegal immigrants have to wait until the borders are deemed secure before they can get any legal status.**¶In addition to the hot-button social issues amendments were other nuts-and-bolts proposals that are no less contentious, such as where to set the level for guest-workers who would be allowed into the country to compete for jobs, or whether to make English the official language of the U.S.¶ With the bill now officially before the Senate, the question is which of those amendments will be allowed up for a vote. The pressure there is on Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Nevada Democrat, who has said he will allow a little latitude but warned that he would have little patience for those he thinks are trying to undercut the bill rather than working sincerely to improve it.¶ “**Be very, very careful of senators who have no intention of voting for this bill**, zero, **but they have this wonderful amendment they want to offer to improve the bill, understanding, as I do** — and I hope you folks also understand this — **they have no intention of voting for the bill no matter what happens on amendments**,” Mr. Reid told reporters.¶ Mr. **Reid’s heavy hand in controlling amendments helped derail a 2007 immigration bill**.¶ Mr. **Reid is again intent on protecting the crux of the immigration deal**, which was worked out by the bipartisan “Gang of Eight” senators, that offers illegal immigrants quick legalization but withholds the full path to citizenship until the government spends more money on border security, creates a new verification system to check workers, and begins to track entries and exits at airports and seaports.¶ **That deal, as it stands, cannot pass the chamber**, **said** Sen. Marco **Rubio**, a Florida Republican who was part of the Gang of Eight and is considered key to selling the bill to conservatives.¶ Mr. **Rubio said the legislation needs stiffer border security, better checks of visitors entering and leaving the country, and more stringent English-language requirements**.¶ Under the bill, illegal immigrants who eventually apply for permanent residency must demonstrate that they understand English, or must show that they have enrolled in classes to learn the language.¶ Mr. Rubio said allowing immigrants to check a box by enrolling in classes is a loophole. He said he would offer an amendment striking that option, which would mean anyone seeking full legal residency would have to prove that they understand English.¶ “This is one of the bill’s shortcomings that came to light, which we can now fix,” Mr. Rubio said.¶ **That is not the only language fight brewing**.¶ Sen. James M. **Inhofe**, Oklahoma Republican, **introduced an amendment that would let businesses declare English-only policies in their workplaces, and another that would make English the official language of the U.S.**¶Designating the official language polls exceptionally well with voters, but proved to be contentious when Congress debated immigration reform in 2006 and 2007.¶ The 82-15 vote Tuesday to head off a filibuster marked an auspicious start for this year’s debate. In a similar vote in 2007, supporters got just 69 votes.¶ The difference this year was that far more Republicans are eager to at least hold the debate, with many of them feeling that their political futures depend on finding a way to reach out to Hispanic voters who view the immigration issue as a litmus test.¶ “This overwhelming vote — a majority of both parties — starts this bill off on just the right foot,” said Sen. Charles E. Schumer, New York Democrat.¶ Now the focus will be on about 20 **Republicans** who voted to begin the debate but who **are likely to want to see major changes before they support the final product**.¶ One of those is Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, who said Tuesday that the legislation has “serious flaws.”¶ He seemed to accept the legalization of illegal immigrants, saying his concerns lie chiefly with how the bill handles border security and with the taxpayer benefits that newly legalized illegal immigrants may be eligible — such as tax credits.¶ “I’m going to need more than an assurance from [Homeland Security Secretary Janet] Napolitano, for instance, that the border is secure to feel comfortable about the situation on the border,” Mr. **McConnell** said.¶ He **said he would support an amendment by** Sen. John **Cornyn**, Texas Republican, **to require the border to be secured before illegal immigrants can gain initial legal status.**¶Mr. **Reid has declared that a poison pill**.¶ Then there’s **the gay-rights amendment from** Sen. Patrick J. **Leahy**, Vermont Democrat. While federal law doesn’t recognize same-sex marriage, his amendment **would grant immigration benefits to partners in states that perform such unions.**¶“Seeking equal protection under our laws for the LGBT community is the right thing to do,” Mr. Leahy said in a statement.¶ Mr. Leahy made a similar move in the Senate Judiciary Committee last month, but withdrew the amendment at the last moment. Although he was committed to the issue, he said, he didn’t want to threaten to bring down the entire bill over gay-rights questions.¶ Offering it on the floor is less dangerous because it likely will take 60 votes to add it to the bill — a threshold he is unlikely to achieve. Seeking a vote now would give him a chance to take a stand without fear of derailing the full bill.¶ **Some of the Catholic and Evangelical leaders that are supporting the immigration bill had warned they could withdraw their support over the gay-rights issue**.

### Not Top of Docket

#### House Republicans see immigration as bottom of docket issue; no rush to discuss

Matthews 7/13 (Laura “A 2013 Immigration Reform Bill Doesn't Top House Priorities For July” ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-doesnt-top-house-priorities-july-1336059)

The House of Representatives returns this week to continue working on sticky legislative issues, but passing a 2013 immigration reform bill isn't high on the list of its priorities. In fact, a memo sent last Friday by House Majority Leader Eric Cantor merely lists immigration as an afterthought.¶ Instead, energy and economic growth, student loans, appropriations and government oversight (think IRS and Benghaz i scandals) top the legislative agenda for July.¶ Prior to leaving for the July 4 recess, the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill that provides a 13- year path to citizenship and boosts security along the southern border, including doubling the number of patrol agents. However, House Republicans have dismissed that legislation, calling it dead on arrival, and said members will work on their own measures. Still, only a small number of immigration-related bills have passed House committees, dealing with mandatory employment verification, agriculture guest workers and high-skilled workers, interior enforcement and border security. House members working on a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill for about four years now have yet to produce it.¶ Whether there will be a vote on a House comprehensive measure is still up in the air, but lawmakers in the lower chamber could possibly vote on smaller border security legislation bills this month.¶ “The House may begin consideration of the border security measures that have been passed by the Homeland Security and Judiciary Committees and begin reviewing other immigration proposals,” Cantor’s memo read.¶ There will be a special House conference on immigration Wednesday, regarding how to best reform the system. Concerned that the Senate bill puts legalizing the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants currently in the country ahead of border security, Rep. Raul Labrador, R-Idaho, and former member of the House immigration reform gang, remains optimistic, despite its low priority.¶ But Republicans have to do this right politically or it’s “going to be the death of the Republican Party,” he said on MSNBC’S “Meet the Press” this Sunday. Failure to do so will mean losing the base, while illegal immigration continues and the Hispanic community will turn to those offering a faster pathway to citizenship, Labrador said. Labrador left immigration talks in June because he reportedly couldn’t agree on healthcare. The House bill would reportedly offer a 15-year path to citizenship.¶ “I think we lose on both grounds if we don’t do it right,” he said.

#### Boehner not worried about a vote; Democrats are pushing and say that Republican votes are there for passage

Matthews 7/13(Laura, “Here's Why House Republicans Are In No Rush On A 2013 Immigration Reform Bill” ibtimes.com/heres-why-house-republicans-are-no-rush-2013-immigration-reform-bill-1333259)

There’s no sense of urgency by House Republicans to quickly pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill, because there’s no public outcry as yet - - and business and religious groups are just as divided as lawmakers.¶ At least that’s the sentiment being passed on by Republican lawmakers who have met with those groups.¶ “The faith community is divided on this issue as well,” Rep. James Lankfor, R-Okla., told the Hill. He added that business groups are divided over the flow of future immigrants and a guest worker program.¶ The Senate passed its comprehensive immigration reform bill last week, with a solid 68-32 vote. It was the result of bipartisan negotiations with the pro-business Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO, the largest federation of trade unions in the U.S., working to find common ground on issues such as admitting foreign workers.¶ Now all eyes are looking at the House, where immigration reform advocates are hoping members will follow suit with a plan that also provides a path to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants currently in the country.¶ “Speaker John Boehner and his leadership team face a decision that will have ramifications for a generation: Block a roadmap to citizenship vote, obstruct the will of overwhelming majorities of working people and face a generation of electoral decline -- or support citizenship and embrace America’s diverse future,” AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka said last week.¶ But Boehner, a Republican from Ohio, is refusing to bring the Senate’s version of an immigration reform bill to the House floor for a vote. He is also in no hurry. the Republican conference will hold a special meeting on Wednesday. A bipartisan group in the House has been working on a comprehensive bill but is yet to produce it. So far, the House has begun working on single-issue bills that deal with border security, interior enforcement and guest worker programs.¶ “If immigration reform is going to work, it’s essential that the American people have the confidence that it’s being done correctly,” Boehner said last week. “That’s how the House will approach this issue.”¶ Despite the tough talk, Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., and a member of the House Gang of Seven, whose bipartisan work for immigration reform mirrors the Senate's Gang of Eight, believes Boehner will compromise. He told MSNBC earlier this week that a majority of the House is ready to vote on reform, especially dozens in the Republican caucus.¶ “Boehner is not the kind of -- how would I say it -- ideological guys,” Gutierrez said. “He’s not a very ideological person when it comes to pushing. He wants to reach a consensus, I believe that about him, and he’s in a quandary right now with a majority of his party that doesn’t want him to allow a vote for comprehensive immigration reform.”¶ Gutierrez said there will be a vote in the House on comprehensive immigration reform, because the bills proposed so far are “the same failed policies of the past.” Democrats have argued that the interior enforcement bill passed by the House Judiciary Committee known as the SAFE Act would instantly criminaliz e the 11 million undocumented people living in America and lead to profiling.¶ “If they want to be a party of localities, of provinces and maybe some states, then don’t allow a vote,” he added. “They will never be a national party ever again.”

**Link**

**General – Boehner link turn**

**Boehner loves the plan**

**Palmer, 12** (Doug, columnist @ Reuters specializing in trade issues, 5/8, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/05/08/usa-trade-boehner-idUSL1E8G81HM20120508)

The U.S. **Congress' top Republican** on Tuesday **called for deeper U.S economic engagement with Latin America**, but also **expressed concern over Iranian influence in the region** and the "alarming willingness" of some governments to abandon international norms. **"In** both Colombia and **Mexico, and the entire hemisphere, the U.S. must be clear that we will not disengage in the fight for free markets** and free, secure people," U.S. House of Representatives Speaker John **Boehner said** in remarks prepared for delivery at the U.S. State Department. "**We must be clear that we will be there, with our** friends and **partners in the region**, committed to fighting and winning the war for a free, stable, and prosperous hemisphere," **Boehner said, speaking to** the Council of Americas, **an organization representing companies that do business in the region**. **Boehner is due** on Tuesday **to receive an award from the group for his work** last year on **winning** congressional **approval of free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama** and South Korea. The pacts were negotiated during the Republican administration of former President George W. Bush, but President Barack Obama, a Democrat, did not submit the agreements to Congress until late 2011, after negotiating changes to make them more palatable to Democrats and securing a commitment for renewal of a worker retraining program known as trade adjustment assistance. "When the Colombia Free Trade Agreement enters into force (on May 15), it will be an important moment for the prosperity of our hemisphere. It is equally important that the Panama Free Trade Agreement be fully implemented in the months ahead," Boehner said, referring to the Obama administration's ongoing work with Panama to implement that agreement. **Boehner said it was important the United States "keep the momentum going" by negotiating new agreements to open markets to American exports**, and said he was disappointed Obama has not sought legislation known as "Trade Promotion Authority" which would help the White House do that. Meanwhile, **Boehner called Iran's attempt to gain influence in the region a "major threat" to democracy and prosperity.** Iranian President Mahmoud Admadinejad's visit to Venezuela and Cuba "underscored the designs Iran has for expanding its influence in Latin America, and its eagerness to forge bonds with governments in the Western Hemisphere that have demonstrated a lesser interest in freedom and democracy," Boehner said.

**Trade Affs – A2: Union Link Key**

**Labors political influence is collapsing – multiple reasons**

**Hemingway, 11** (Mark, CBS News, 4/27, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2011/04/27/opinion/main20057833\_page2.shtml)

While unions hoped that Card Check would rapidly reverse the decline in their membership, the scheme was also meant to help fix their pension plans. Once companies were unionized, the power of collective bargaining could force them to join foundering multi-employer plans, shoring these up. Accordingly, the AFL-CIO declared Card Check legislation "the number one priority of America's union movement." **With Democrats controlling Congress and a labor champion in the White House, unions seemed confident Card Check would pass**. The legislation was introduced in both houses of Congress in March 2009, and Obama, Vice President Biden, and Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis all made public statements in support of it. **Then . . . nothing. Card Check stalled** as business interests such as the Chamber of Commerce became increasingly vocal in their opposition. Big labor pursued other political solutions. Senator Bob Casey of Pennsylvania introduced the Create Jobs and Save Benefits Act of 2010, which was criticized as a bailout of multi-employer pension plans. It was actually worse than that. The bill would have essentially created a new entitlement by requiring taxpayers to backstop union pension plans in perpetuity. Casey's bill went nowhere?--?and, adding insult to injury, Representative Earl Pomeroy, the North Dakota Democrat who'd sponsored the bill in the House, was defeated last November. As it became clear last year that a Republican takeover of the House was inevitable, some feared that Democrats would make a truly radical move in the lame duck session of Congress to save their biggest campaign donor. Just weeks before the election, Democrat Tom Harkin of Iowa and Independent Bernie Sanders of Vermont held a hearing of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) exploring Guaranteed Retirement Accounts, or GRAs. These are a union-backed plan to create a national retirement system that would in effect force Americans to stop putting their retirement savings into private 401(k) accounts and to send their money to the government instead. But **the lame duck session came and went without any bold Democratic move to save the unions**. Democrats were thumped in November, and Republicans took control of the House of Representatives with a 48-seat majority. In a radio interview on March 22, Senator Sherrod Brown, a pro-union Democrat from Ohio, confirmed what many suspected. Card Check was "not going to happen now," he said. If Card Check was dead, the American labor movement's biggest reason for hope had been snuffed out. Which brings us to a third existential threat for unions. Rather than adapt to the changing economic climate and expand their organizing efforts, unions in the past decade focused nearly all their resources on lobbying for a political solution to their woes. After all that money and effort, they have no solution to their long-term problems. What they do have is debt. In 2009, the AFL-CIO's $103 million in liabilities exceeded its assets by $21 million. The SEIU, which had very rapidly become the most politically influential union in the country, had financed its ascent with money it didn't have. The union's liabilities were $7.6 million in 2000. After the 2008 election, in which, again, the SEIU spent more than $80 million, the union was $102 million in debt. It has since reduced that debt to $85 million?--?but **union leaders are clearly worried about the state of their finances**. Their solution? A very public campaign against Bank of America, organized by none other than Stephen Lerner. This may have backfired when SEIU gained a great deal of negative national publicity for sending a mob of protesters to the home of a Bank of America executive (who turned out to be a lifelong Democrat with ties to the Clintons), frightening his adolescent son who was home alone. The SEIU claims it is protesting unfair lending practices. But it's obvious the union is really trying to intimidate its biggest creditor: The SEIU owes Bank of America more than $80 million. Political death knell? **For unions, last year's election may have been the death knell. For the first time, union support could be viewed as an electoral liability**. Conservative grassroots groups targeted public sector unions, especially the SEIU, throughout the campaign, and Tea Party-fueled Republican candidates?--?including Scott Walker?--?explicitly campaigned on curbing union excesses. Karl Rove's American Crossroads PAC, which spent about $65 million in 2010, is already running ads designed to make public sector unions a campaign issue in 2012. **Unions also created a big messaging headache for Democrats**. During the election, Democrats tried their best to make corporate influence a major issue. The White House publicly asserted that the Chamber of Commerce was trying to influence the election with foreign money, though this had been widely debunked. And congressional Democrats maintained that the Citizens United Supreme Court decision that upended much of the campaign finance regulatory regime was allowing corporate groups to flood the election with money. Then Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi promised to tie the GOP to corporate campaign cash "like doggy-doo stuck on your shoe," and at one point Democrats circulated a memo claiming that outside spending groups affiliated with Republicans had outspent Democratic groups $200 million to $7 million. The problem was that this narrative was undercut at every turn by the unions' outsized political influence. While the White House was trying to demonize the Chamber of Commerce, the Wall Street Journal reported that the biggest donor in the 2010 election was actually the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). A single public sector union had spent $87.5 million in recycled tax dollars?--?supporting Democrats. AFSCME's political director even bragged to the Wall Street Journal, "We're the big dog." Sure enough, thanks to unions' spending more than $200 million on Democrats, the Democrats outspent Republicans in 2010 and still were handed the worst electoral defeat in more than 60 years. "Overall, Democratic candidates in the 63 races that flipped to the GOP had $206.4 million behind them, a tally that includes candidate fundraising and spending by parties and interests," reported the Washington Post on November 3, the day after the midterms. "That compares to only $171.7 million for their GOP rivals." Claiming the country is jeopardized by corporate dominance of elections, when 11 of the top 20 political donors to elections since 1989 are labor unions, has proven to be a losing message. It's also worth noting that most corporate political action committees?--?including those representing Wall Street?--?have given more money to Democrats than Republicans during the last few election cycles. Washington Examiner columnist Timothy Carney notes that Democrats had at least a $60 million edge in PAC contributions in last year's election. As unions' membership continues to dwindle and their political spending increases, it's hard to argue that unions are anything other than a special interest. By the time the Wisconsin protests broke out in February, **the White House** initially voiced support but **was afraid of appearing too pro-union**. When union officials asked the White House to send Joe Biden to make an appearance at the protests, the White House declined. Union leaders then asked for labor secretary Hilda Solis. Once again, the White House declined. It seems the Obama administration is mysteriously lacking a pair of comfortable shoes. The head of the National Nurses United union publicly accused the Obama administration of "betrayal." **Evidence of the rapid decline of the American labor movement is hard even for** someone as indebted to unions as Barack **Obama to ignore. The unions' political fortunes are poised to fall faster and farther than anyone anticipated, and Democrats are starting to hedge their bets. Walking the picket line these days looks more and more like walking the plank.**

**Public/Private Sector Union divide crushes political influence of labor**

**Hemingway, 11** (Mark, CBS News, 4/27, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2011/04/27/opinion/main20057833\_page2.shtml)

So why has so dedicated and smart a union organizer as Lerner lapsed into abject despair? Few people are better positioned to evaluate the state of organized labor's finances and organizing capacity, and Lerner's assessment at Pace was brutal: "**Unions are almost dead**. We cannot survive doing what we do." **Unions are** indeed **facing existential threats**. The first resides **in broad economic and demographic trends that are transferring power from private sector unions to public sector unions**. Public sector unions, unlike private sector unions, are actually growing. In 1954, 39 percent of the American workforce was unionized?--?and public sector unions did not exist in any meaningful way. Last year, 11.9 percent of the American workforce was unionized. More distressingly for Lerner, private sector union membership shrank by about 10 percent in 2009, so that for the first time public sector union workers outnumbered private sector union workers. It may seem counterintuitive, but the continued growth of **public sector unions may have negative consequences for organized labor overall**. Some select public sector professions still carry political influence?--?such as police, firefighters, and teachers?--?but on the whole, **government bureaucrats are far less sympathetic figures** than, say, manufacturing workers. Public sector unions are also much newer, and their very existence has always been controversial. As recently as 1955, no less a figure than George Meany, then head of the AFL-CIO, believed it was "impossible to bargain collectively with the government."

**Cuba No Link/Turns**

**Times Changed – momentum, powerful congressional pressure, CBC, dems, farm lobby and lugar**

**Washington Post, 9** (4/9, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/08/AR2009040803769.html

HALF A DOZEN members of **the C**ongressional **B**lack **C**aucus **spent hours huddling with** Fidel and Raúl **Castro** in Havana this week **as part of a swelling campaign to normalize relations with Cuba**. "It is time to open dialogue and discussion," Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.) told a news conference in Washington after their return. "Cubans do want dialogue. They do want talks." Funny, then, that in five days on the island the Congress members found no time for dialogue with Afro-Cuban dissident Jorge Luis García Pérez. Mr. García, better known as "Antúnez," is a renowned advocate of human rights who has often been singled out for harsh treatment because of his color. "The authorities in my country," he has said, "have never tolerated that a black person [could dare to] oppose the regime." His wife, Iris, is a founder of the Rosa Parks Women's Civil Rights Movement, named after an American hero whom Afro-Cubans try to emulate. The couple have been on a hunger strike since Feb. 17, to demand justice for an imprisoned family member. They are part of a substantial and steadily growing civil movement advocating democratic change in Cuba -- one that U.S. advocates of detente with the Castros appear determined to ignore. **In addition to the Black Caucus, the congressional campaign is led by longtime advocates** for the Latin American left **such as Sen**. Christopher J. **Dodd** (D-Conn.), by f**arm state representatives eager to increase the $400 million in food the U**nited **S**tates **already exports** annually to Cuba, **and** by Sen. Richard G. **Lugar** (R-Ind.), **the senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.** Mr. **Lugar dispatched staff** members **to Cuba** this year to report **on the prospects for improved relations**; they also didn't meet with anyone from the democratic opposition. **They did propose lifting** all **restrictions** on travel to Cuba by Americans -- something that could give Cuba's state-run tourism industry a $1 billion annual boost -- **and** Mr. **Lugar is** now co-**sponsoring legislation** that would do just that. **The congressional pressure**, and that by leftist Latin American presidents who have been streaming to Cuba in recent months, **is very likely to undermine** President **Obama,** who has promised that "liberty" would be at the center of his Cuba policy. Mr. Obama is expected to announce a relaxation on travel and gifts to family members by Cuban Americans before next week's Summit of the Americas, and he has said he is open to dialogue with the regime. But he has also said that the lifting of what remains of the U.S. trade embargo should be linked to steps by Cuba toward democratic change. That is a sensible and forward-looking strategy, especially given the age and failing health of the Castros. But, for the moment, the brothers show no sign of offering such change -- in fact they have recently moved to foreclose the possibility, by purging two younger and relatively liberal-minded ministers. Fifty-four of the 75 leading democracy and human rights activists jailed six years ago last month are still imprisoned, along with hundreds of other political detainees. As long as **Congress is moving to unilaterally dismantle U.S. leverage** -- and shunning Cuba's democratic opposition -- the regime will have no incentive to compromise.

**2012 Election Results was *political game changer* on Cuba – no longer drains capital**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

The 2012 Election Perhaps **the most surprising result of the election was that, despite Romney's efforts to appeal to the community's traditional anti-communism, Obama won almost half the CubanAmerican vote** in Florida. Two statewide exit polls showed Obama winning the Cuban-American vote, 49% to Romney's 47% (Edison Research National Election Pool), or losing it narrowly, 48% to Romney's 52% (Bendixen & Amandi International). **No Democrat had ever done so well among this solidly Republican constituency.** \* Conventional wisdom among Democratic political operatives had been that a presidential candidate needs to win 30% of the Cuban-American vote to carry Florida. The only Democrats 6 since 1980 to meet that threshold and carry the state were Bill Clinton in 1996 (35% of the Cuban-American vote) and Barack Obama in 2008 (35%). Clinton was the first Democrat to actively campaign for the Cuban-American vote, beginning in 1992 with his endorsement of the Cuban Democracy Act. Although Clinton carried just 22% of the Cuban-American vote in 1992, that was a better showing than any Democrat since Jimmy Carter (Table 1). Clinton's success in 1996, after signing the Helms-Burton legislation tightening the embargo, convinced Democrats that a tough policy toward Cuba was the right electoral strategy to win enough Cuban-American votes to carry Florida. If a Democratic candidate was just as bellicose as his Republican opponent, a significant number of Cuban-Americans would decide their vote based on other issues– issues on which their policy preferences tended to be closer to those of other Latinos, and to Democrats. In 2008, Hillary Clinton and John McCain followed the tried and true path of lambasting Cuba to appeal to conservative Cuban-American voters, but Obama adopted an alternative strategy. He sought to cut into the Republicans' traditional electoral advantage by winning over moderates-- a growing segment of the community according to opinion polls. He promised to end restrictions on remittances and family travel for Cuban Americans, resume "people-to-people" educational and cultural exchanges, and engage Cuba in bilateral talks on issues of mutual interest. Engagement, he argued, offered the best hope for promoting "a democratic opening in Cuba." Advocating engagement proved to be a winning strategy. **By carrying Florida** **in 2008** 7 **with 35% of the Cuban-American vote, Obama proved that a Democrat could take a moderate stance on Cuba and still make inroads with this solidly Republican constituency. His even stronger showing in 2012 proved that the 2008 result was not just an anomaly. Having defied conventional wisdom that only a "get tough on Cuba" platform would sell** in south Florida, **Obama changed the domestic political dynamics of the issue, making new thinking about Cuba politically feasible.**

**Doesn’t drain capital – multiple reasons**

**LaFranchi, ‘08**

Howard LaFranchi, the Christian Science Monitor's diplomacy correspondent in DC since 2001. Previously, he spent 12 years as a reporter in the field; serving five years as the Monitor's Paris bureau chief from 1989 to 1994, and as a Latin America correspondent in Mexico City from 1994 to 2001. LaFranchi has continued to travel as diplomacy correspondent and covered the Iraq War from the Monitor's Baghdad bureau on numerous occasions.Prior to joining the Monitor, LaFranchi worked as the City Hall reporter for the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram. He is a graduate of UC Berkeley Journalism School and has a Masters Degree in Journalism from Boston University.Christian Science Monitor, 12/15, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2008/1215/p04s01-usgn.html>

A new approach could represent a relatively easy first step down a generally more controversial path of engaging with America's adversaries. A desire by President-elect Obama to enter the White House signaling change in US foreign policy may well lead to quick -- though perhaps modest -- action on Cuba. When he assumes office, Mr. Obama will be largely focused on addressing the worst economic dive in generations. But in that context there are several reasons a shift toward Cuba -- a thorn in the side of the last nine presidents -- could begin early next year: •**Obama could take a number of steps**, such as easing contacts between Cuban-Americans and their families on the island, **by executive action** -- thus signaling a shift from Bush policies **without dedicating a lot of effort to it**. •The November **elections and recent polls reveal a Cuban-American community more disposed to opening up channels to the** communist **island, even though the Castro brothers continue to govern it -- meaning the political capital spent on a shift would be negligible.** •Moving on Cuba would give Obama something of a "twofer," signaling to the rest of Latin America the advent of a different policy toward the hemisphere. •**Making Cuba a test case of** a new **willingness to engage with US adversaries could be a relatively easy first step down a generally more controversial path. Cuba presents Obama with "low-hanging fruit," easily picked**, to suggest "a new foreign-policy direction," **says** Anya Landau **French, a senior fellow at** the **Lexington Institute**, a free-market-oriented think tank in Washington. Steps as basic as increasing antinarcotics cooperation, she says, offer "a way to break from Bush policy without a great effort." None of this means the 48-year-old US embargo of Cuba will quickly go by the boards. Despite the longstanding view of many Cuba experts and a majority of Latin American leaders that the embargo hasn't worked -- a view Obama himself held before his run for the presidency -- the president-elect now says the embargo is "an important inducement to change" that he would lift once "freedom and justice" arrive on the island. What Obama is likely to do is ease restrictions on travel to Cuba by Cuban-Americans and on the flow of remittances from Cuban-Americans across the Straits of Florida. Both moves would revert to openings pursued by the Clinton administration that President Bush reversed. During the campaign, Susan Rice, Obama's chief foreign-policy adviser (and now tapped by him to become U.S. ambassador to the United Nations), said Obama would maintain the embargo "as leverage to use as we work to negotiate with the Cuban government." She called lifting the general ban on trade and formal diplomatic ties "the ultimate step." Some political observers considered Obama's shift in stance on the embargo a bow to the anti-Castro Cuban-American community. But some **recent polls suggest that the majority of Cuban-Americans -- and especially the younger set -- no longer support the embargo. Over half (55 percent) of Cuban-Americans support ending the embargo, according to** a poll conducted by Florida International University's Institute for **Public Opinion Research** shortly after Election Day. **The poll found lowest support for the embargo among Cubans** who came to the United States most recently. **Another focal point of support for change in US Cuba policy is the business community. "Cuba presents an easy opportunity for Obama** to demonstrate that change is coming to American foreign policy," **says** Jake **Colvin,** vice president for global trade issues **at the National Foreign Trade Council** in Washington. Speaking at a recent Inter-American Dialogue forum in Washington, he said that suspending restrictions to allow U.S. business to sell machinery to Cuba and rescinding a "cash in advance" rule on agricultural sales to Cuba are "innovative" steps that Obama could take.

**Times Have Changed**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

But **was Obama's success a harbinger of structural realignment in the Cuban-American community or merely** a conjunctural product of **Romney's flawed candidacy? The** Republican ticket had its shortcomings. In 2007, candidate Romney famously ended a speech to stunned Cuban-Americans with Fidel Castro's signature closing, "Patria o muerte! Venceremos!" (Homeland or death! We shall overcome!). Vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan had a record 8 of repeatedly voting in the House of Representatives to end the embargo against Cuba (on the libertarian grounds that the government should not impede free trade). "That did their ticket a lot of harm with Cubans, and allowed us to at least get a hearing with them about many other economic issues," an Obama campaign official said.9 Moreover, the Republican Party's anti-immigrant posture, which hurt it with Latino voters nationwide, hurt it with Cuban-American voters as well. The state's most prominent national Republican elected officials– Senator Marco Rubio, and Representatives Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and Mario Diaz-Balart, all distanced themselves from their Party's hardline on immigration reform. In 1996, when Bill Clinton won 35% of the Cuban-American vote against Bob Dole, 10 the Republican Party was also hurt by its anti-immigration policy. That year, the Republican Platform supported making English the official language, advocated cutting off welfare for noncitizens, and deny citizenship to the U.S.-born children of illegal aliens. Yet despite these 11 problems, **there was growing evidence that Obama's gains** might **represent more** than just Romney's weakness. **Polling** by Florida International University since 1991 **has chronicled** gradual **changes in the Cuban-American community** in south Florida, **both demographically and attitudinally**– changes that, as they begin to manifest themselves in voting behavior, **do not bode well for the Republican Party.** The Cuban-American Electorate **When** FIU began **polling Cuban-Americans south Florida** **in 1991, 87% favored** continuation of the U.S. e**mbargo. By 2011, support had fallen to 56%. In 1993, 75% of respondents opposed the sale of food** to Cuba **and 50% opposed the sale of medicine. By 2011, solid majorities** (65% and 75% respectively) **supported both. In 1991, 55% opposed unrestricted travel** to Cuba, whereas **in 2011, 57% supported unrestricted travel for all Americans** and 66% supported unrestricted travel for Cuban-Americans (Table 2). **These changes in Cuban-American opinion were clearly linked to demographic changes** in the community. Exiles who arrived in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s came as political refugees, motivated principally by their opposition to the socialist course of the revolution. **Those who arrived** in the Mariel exodus **in 1980 and afterwards were more likely to have left for economic reasons. Recent arrivals**, especially those who arrived in the post-cold war era, **were far more likely to have maintained ties with family on the island**. A 2007 poll of Cuban-Americans in south Florida found that 58.3% were sending remittances to Cuba, but fewer than half of those who arrived before 1985 were sending money, whereas three quarters of more recent arrivals were. **The differences in age and experience** among different waves of 12 migrants **produced sharply different opinions about relations with the island, with more recent arrivals being far more likely to favor policies that reduce bilateral tensions** and barriers to family linkages, especially the ability to travel and send remittances (Table 3).

**No political support for the embargo**

**Brush 13** – MSN Money (Michael, “Time to invest in Cuba?” http://money.msn.com/investing/time-to-invest-in-cuba)

2. **Political support for the embargo is eroding. Another problem for embargo aficionados is that younger Cuban Americans in Florida, the all-important next generation of voters, just aren't as passionate about it as their parents and grandparents were.** "When I lecture down there, they couldn't care less about Castro and the embargo," says Roett. **A recent poll by Florida International University in Miami bears this out. It found that just 50% of Cuban-Americans still support the embargo, and 80% think it has failed.** It's also worth noting that Obama got a lot more of the Cuban-American vote in Florida in the 2012 election, despite the awareness that he is more willing to lift the embargo, says Hidalgo. **With their constituents defecting on the issue, congressional backers of the embargo may be losing ground. "The Cuban vote in Florida is changing, thus sticking with the embargo doesn't makes sense," believes Hidalgo.**

**Opposition to the plan is diminishing**

**Bandow 12** – senior fellow at the Cato Institute and a former special assistant to former US president Ronald Reagan (Doug, 12/11, “Time to End the Cuba Embargo,” http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/time-end-cuba-embargo)

**The embargo survives largely because of Florida’s political importance. Every presidential candidate wants to win the Sunshine State’s electoral votes, and the Cuban American community is a significant voting bloc. But the political environment is changing. A younger, more liberal generation of Cuban Americans with no memory of life in Cuba is coming to the fore.** Said Wayne Smith, a diplomat who served in Havana: “for the first time in years, maybe there is some chance for a change in policy.” **And there are now many more new young Cuban Americans who support a more sensible approach to Cuba. Support for the Republican Party also is falling.** According to some exit polls Barack Obama narrowly carried the Cuban American community in November, after receiving little more than a third of the vote four years ago. He received 60 percent of the votes of Cuban Americans born in the United States. **Barack Obama increased his votes among Cuban Americans after liberalizing contacts with the island.** He also would have won the presidency without Florida, demonstrating that the state may not be essential politically. **Today even the GOP is no longer reliable. For instance, though Republican vice-presidential nominee Paul Ryan has defended the embargo in recent years, that appears to reflect ambition rather than conviction. Over the years he voted at least three times to lift the embargo**, explaining: “The embargo doesnt work. It is a failed policy. It was probably justified when the Soviet Union existed and posed a threat through Cuba. I think its become more of a crutch for Castro to use to repress his people. All the problems he has, he blames the American embargo.”

**Links don’t apply because increasing Cuban American support**

**Stabroek News, ‘8**

11/14, http://www.stabroeknews.com/2008/opinion/editorial/11/14/mr-obama-and-cuba/

Many other Cuban Americans want to see the Bush administration’s restrictions lifted on their ability to travel to Cuba and to send money to relatives still living there. Many others are ruing the lost opportunities for business with Cuba, which are going to Europeans and Latin Americans.

Dissidents in Cuba have told foreign journalists that they hope that Mr Obama will seek better ties with Cuba, which could lead to a relaxation of restrictions on their democratic right to express themselves. Even the Cuban government has congratulated Mr Obama on his election and Foreign Investment Minister Marta Lomas has reiterated that Havana is hoping for an easing of the embargo.

But although Mr Obama has indicated that he is committed to a new diplomacy and dialogue with those whose views differ from America’s, the policy of the incoming administration towards Cuba is still unclear. In his campaign, as we have previously noted, Mr Obama said that he would remove the restrictions on Cuban Americans travelling to Cuba and sending remittances to relatives. He also stated that he would be ready to talk with Raúl Castro. He however told the Cuban American National Foundation in Miami that he would maintain the embargo.

Now, even though Florida’s three Republican Cuban American members of Congress were re-elected on pledges to hold firm on the embargo, there is evidence to indicate that a growing number of Cuban Americans, especially from the younger generation, are no longer as obsessed as their elders with hating the Castros and all that they stand for.

The optimists hope that, having carried Florida, even winning in traditional Republican, anti-Castro, pro-isolation counties, Mr Obama might feel confident enough to go beyond his campaign platform and implement a sea change in US policy towards Cuba.

There are other factors that might support such a view. Last month, the European Union re-established cooperation with Cuba after a hiatus of five years because of a diplomatic row over political repression in Cuba. In addition, the announcement, also in October, of the discovery of possibly some 20 billion barrels of oil in Cuban waters in the Gulf of Mexico and the fact that Brazil’s state-owned oil company Petrobras has already signed an agreement with Cuba to explore for oil, could cause pressure to be brought to bear by US petroleum interests on the Obama administration to open up to Cuba.

**2ac – mexico aff – link turn**

**Turn: Securing effective border security cooperation with Mexico key to immigration reform**

**AP 5/2**/13 (“Obama to pitch immigration overhaul in Mexico”, <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-05-02/business/38977838_1_security-strategy-border-security-security-relationship>, CMR)

WASHINGTON — President Barack Obama has his domestic ambition at the top of his travel agenda as he travels to Mexico on Thursday. **To sell** his **immigration** overhaul back home, **he needs** a growing economy in Mexico and **a Mexican president willing to help him secure the border**.¶ Obama was to fly to Mexico City on Thursday to meet with President Enrique Pena Nieto, eager to promote Mexico's economic success and the neighboring country's place as the second largest export market for U.S. goods and services. Mexicans will be hanging on the president's words, but Obama also has in mind an important audience back in the United States.¶ Though the role played by Latino voters in last year's U.S. presidential election gets much credit for the current momentum for changing immigration laws and providing a path to citizenship for 11 million immigrants in the U.S. illegally, another reason for the change in attitudes is that **stronger border protections** and the recession **have been disincentives to cross into the U.S**. **As a result, illegal immigration has declined**.¶ "With **Mexico**, first and foremost, they **are critical to** our ability to **secure the border**," said Ben Rhodes, an Obama deputy national security adviser. "All the **immigration plans** that have been contemplated **put a focus on securing the border as an essential priority and starting point for** immigration **reform**."

**2ac – mexico aff – link defense**

**Plan avoids partisanship**

**CSIS 4** (U.S.-Mexico Border¶ Security and the¶ Evolving Security¶ Relationship¶ Recommendations for¶ Policymakers, April, <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/0404_bordersecurity.pdf>, CMR)

**There can be no doubt** that the future of **Mexico-U.S. relations will** for the ¶ indefinite future **be shaped** to a large degree **by how the two** countries **work** ¶ **together** to manage, selectively inspect, and regulate cross-border traffic. One ¶ objective, which will perhaps be of equal importance in both countries, is that no ¶ attack on the United States be perpetrated from terrorist bases in Mexico or that no ¶ terrorists easily cross the border on their way to attacking U.S. targets. In the ¶ United States, **it is highly unlikely** that **there will be any significant partisan political** ¶ **disagreements about these and related imperatives of border security.**

**2ac – link turn – winners win**

**PC isn’t finite or key – the plan is a win that spills over to future victories**

**Hirsh 2/7** – chief correspondent of National Journal (Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>, CMR)

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President **Obama will** do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will **lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list** highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the **pundits will** do what they always do this time of year: They will **talk about how** unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how **much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through**.¶ Most of **this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens** over the next four years.¶ Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen.¶ What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.”¶ As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.¶ Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.¶ The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”¶ The real problem is that **the idea of political capital**—or mandates, or momentum—**is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong.** “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of **political capital**—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—**is very rare. It almost never happens**. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, **political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary**. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, **it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history**.¶ Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger.¶ But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, **the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try.** Or **as Ornstein** himself **once wrote** years ago, “**Winning wins**.” In theory, and in practice, **depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time**, **he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals,** depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some **political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is**, at best, **an empty concept**, **and** that almost **nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it.** “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. **Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital**. “The idea here is**, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors”** Ornstein says. “**If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”**¶ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ¶ Sometimes, **a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well**. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?”¶

**2ac – link turn – winners win (GOP unity)**

**Forcing controversial fights key to Obama’s agenda—the alt is gridlock**

**Dickerson ’13** John Dickerson, Slate, 1/18/13, Go for the Throat!, [www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/barack\_obama\_s\_second\_inaugural\_address\_the\_president\_should\_declare\_war.single.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2013/01/barack_obama_s_second_inaugural_address_the_president_should_declare_war.single.html), CMR

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. **Gridlock** over the fiscal cliff **preceded** it and **gridlock** over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, **the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that** the president's **clashes with** House Republicans **will end soon**. Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day. But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That bipartisan bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country. **The challenge for** President **Obama’s** speech is the challenge of his **second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires** something **more than** simply the clever application of **predictable stratagems**. Washington’s **partisan rancor**, the size of the problems facing government, **and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president** who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation **can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP**. If he wants to transform American politics, **he must go for the throat**. President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker. How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack **Obama** of the first administration **might have approached the task by finding** some **Republicans to deal with and** then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would **win some of their votes**. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. **That's the old way. He has abandoned that.** **He doesn't think it will work** and **he doesn't have the time.** As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the **Republicans are dead set on opposing him**. **They cannot be unchained by schmoozing**. **Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation**. **Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges** in 2014 **are not going to be willing partners.** He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name. **Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize**. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. **Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to** either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or **cause a rift in the party that will leave it**, at least temporarily, **in disarray**.

**1ar – winners win - general**

**Winners win – legislative victories build momentum**

**Hirsh 2/7** – chief correspondent of National Journal (Michael, “There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>, CMR)

**In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes**. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—**there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories** **than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible**, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction.¶ Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. **If he can get some early wins**—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—**that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.”**

**Winners Wins**

**Marshall & Prins, Poli Sci Profs, 11** (September 2011, Bryan W. Marshall --- associate professor of political science at Miami University, Brandon C. Prins --- associate professor of political science at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Presidential Studies Quarterly, “Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force”, online, CMR)

**Presidents rely heavily on Congress in converting their political capital into real policy success. Policy success not only shapes the reelection prospects of presidents, but it also builds the president’s reputation for political effectiveness and fuels the prospect for subsequent gains in political capital** (Light 1982). Moreover, the president’s legislative success in foreign policy is correlated with success on the domestic front. On this point, some have largely disavowed the two-presidencies distinction while others have even argued that foreign policy has become a mere extension of domestic policy (Fleisher et al. 2000; Oldfield and Wildavsky 1989) **Presidents implicitly understand that there exists a linkage between their actions in one policy area and their ability to affect another**. The use of force is no exception; in promoting and protecting U.S. interests abroad, presidential decisions are made with an eye toward managing political capital at home (Fordham 2002).

**2ac – no spillover**

**No spillover**

**Berger 3-4**, Judson 2013, “Recurring budget crises could put squeeze on Obama's second-term priorities,” Fox News, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/03/04/recurring-budget-crises-could-put-squeeze-on-obama-second-term-priorities/#ixzz2OknXmt3G>, CMR

Rep. Luis **Gutierrez**, D-Ill., a vocal advocate for immigration reform, **voiced confidence** Monday that **the administration and Congress could handle the busy agenda**. ¶ "The spirit of **bipartisan cooperation that is keeping the immigration issue moving forward has not been poisoned by the sequester and budget stalemate**, so far," he said in a statement. "**The** two sets of **issues** seem to **exist in parallel universes where I can disagree with my Republican colleagues strenuously on budget matters, but still work with them** effectively **to** eventually **reach an immigration compromise**. ... I remain extremely optimistic that **immigration reform is going to happen this year**." ¶ Immigration reform **efforts are still marching along despite the budget drama**. Obama met last week on the issue with Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who both are part of a bipartisan group crafting legislation.

**1ar – no spillover**

**Issues compartmentalized**

**Edwards 2k** [Distinguished Professor of Political Science, director of the Center for Presidential Studies, Texas A&M University (George C. III, March. “Building Coalitions.” Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 30, Iss. 1.)]

Besides not considering the full range of available views, members of Congress are **not** generally **in a position to make trade-offs** between policies. Because of its **decentralization**, Congress usually considers policies **serially**, that is, **without reference to other policies**. Without an integrating mechanism, members have few means by which to set and enforce priorities and to emphasize the policies with which the president is most concerned. This latter point is especially true when the opposition party controls Congress.

**2ac – pc not key**

**Political capital is irrelevant**

**Dickinson 9** (Matthew, previously taught at Harvard University, where he also received his Ph.D, professor of political science at Middlebury College, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” May 26, 2009 Presidential Power <http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/>, CMR]

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns for its summer recess in early August. So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5. (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. **Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress.** I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, **they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences?** How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? **These measures**, however, **are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power.** This is because **how members of Congress vote on a** nominee or **legislative item is rarely influenced** **by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants.** (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) **Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying.** But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

**1ar – pc not key**

**--8% chance of the internal link**

**Beckmann 11** [Matthew N Beckmann and Vimal Kumar 11, Associate Professor of Political Science at UC Irvine, econ prof at the Indian Institute of Tech, “Opportunism in Polarization”, Presidential Studies Quarterly; Sep 2011; 41, 3, CMR]

The final important piece in our theoretical model—**presidents' political capital**— also **finds support** in these analyses, **though** the **results** here **are less reliable**. **Presidents operating under the specter of strong economy and high approval ratings get an important, albeit moderate, increase in their chances for prevailing on "key" Senate roll-call votes** (b = .10, se = .06, p < .10). Figure 4 displays the substantive implications of these results in the context of polarization, showing that **going from the lower third of political capital to the upper third increases presidents' chances for success by 8 percentage points** (in a setting like 2008). **Thus, political capital's impact does provide an important boost to presidents' success on Capitol Hill, but it is certainly not potent enough to overcome basic congressional realities**. **Political capital is just strong enough to put a presidential thumb on the congressional scales, which often will not matter**, but can in close cases.

**--Presidential leadership’s irrelevant**

**Jacobs and King 10**, University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, (Lawrence and Desmond, “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics (2010), 8: 793-802, CMR)

But **personality is not a solid foundation for a persuasive explanation of presidential impact and the shortfalls or accomplishments of Obama's presidency.** **Modern presidents** have brought divergent individual traits to their jobs and yet they **have routinely failed to enact much of their agendas**. Preeminent policy goals of Bill Clinton (health reform) and George W. Bush (Social Security privatization) met the same fate, though these presidents' personalities vary widely. And presidents like Jimmy Carter—whose personality traits have been criticized as ill-suited for effective leadership—enjoyed comparable or stronger success in Congress than presidents lauded for their personal knack for leadership—from Lyndon Johnson to Ronald Reagan.7 Indeed, **a personalistic account provides little leverage for explaining the disparities in Obama's record—for example why he succeeded legislatively in restructuring health care and higher education, failed in other areas**, and often accommodated stakeholders.

**Decades of rigorous research find that impersonal, structural forces offer the most compelling explanations for presidential impact**.8 **Quantitative research that compares legislative success and presidential personality finds no overall relationship**.9 In his magisterial qualitative and historical study, Stephen Skowronek reveals that institutional dynamics and ideological commitments structure presidential choice and success in ways that trump the personal predilections of individual presidents.10 Findings point to the predominant influence on presidential legislative success of the ideological and partisan composition of Congress, entrenched interests, identities, and institutional design, and a constitutional order that invites multiple and competing lines of authority.

**The widespread presumption**, then, **that Obama's** personal traits or **leadership style account for the obstacles to his policy proposals is called into question by a generation of scholarship on the presidency**. Indeed, **the presumption is** not simply **problematic** analytically, but practically as well. For **the misdiagnosis of the source of presidential weakness may**, paradoxically, **induce failure by distracting the White House from strategies and tactics where presidents can make a difference**. Following a meeting with Obama shortly after Brown's win, one Democratic senator lamented the White House's delusion that a presidential sales pitch will pass health reform—“Just declaring that he's still for it doesn't mean that it comes off life support.”11 Although Obama's re-engagement after the Brown victory did contribute to restarting reform, the senator's comment points to the importance of ideological and partisan coalitions in Congress, organizational combat, institutional roadblocks, and anticipated voter reactions. **Presidential sales pitches go only so far.**

**Impact D**

**General – CIR Fails**

**Even small changes cause a flood of applications --- swamping USCIS processing capacity**

**Murthy 9** (Law Firm, “What if CIR Passes? Can USCIS Handle the Increased Workload?”, NewsBrief, 10-30, http://www.murthy.com/news/n\_cirwkl.html)

Any type of legalization program will face significant opposition, particularly during an economic downturn. However, **given the numbers of individuals possibly eligible, even under a less expansive program, the USCIS must prepare for a potential onslaught of applications if any type of CIR passes and becomes the law**. As many MurthyDotCom and MurthyBulletin readers know from personal experience, the USCIS has historically suffered from backlogs and capacity issues. Were such a measure to pass, **absent substantial changes, a flood of new applications could pose a significant challenge to the processing capacity of the USCIS**. *USCIS Preparing to Expand Rapidly, Should Need Arise* A Reuters blog quoted USCIS spokesman, Bill Wright, as saying, “The agency has been preparing for the advent of any kind of a comprehensive immigration reform, and if that means a surge of applications and operations, we have been working toward that.” USCIS Director, Alejandro Mayorkas, has stated that the goal of the USCIS is to be ready to expand rapidly to handle the increase in applications that would result from CIR. In the past, opponents have used lack of capacity and preparation as an argument against CIR and expansion of eligibility for immigration benefits. *Will CIR Result in Increased or Reduced Backlogs for Others?* Legal immigrants and their employers have concerns about being disadvantaged by any CIR legislation that would provide benefits to undocumented workers. However, true CIR is not limited to these provisions, and would be expected to contain provisions regarding various aspects of legal immigration. CIR certainly will be hotly debated and any proposed legislation will be modified throughout the debate process. As part of the preparations of the USCIS, and in order not to harm those who have already initiated cases under existing law, **the USCIS needs to continue to work on backlogs**. While **significant progress has been made in many areas, and case processing times have been improved greatly**, there are still case backlogs that need to be addressed.

**Private contractors hired to implement the plan causes fraud**

**West 7** (Bill, Chief of the National Security Section – Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “Immigration “Reform” Will Be National Security Disaster”, 5-17, [http://counterterrorismblog.org/2007/ 05/immigration\_reform\_will\_be\_nat.php](http://counterterrorismblog.org/2007/%2005/immigration_reform_will_be_nat.php))

**CIS** has indicated it **would need to bring in private contractor personnel to help deal with the monumental workload increase from reform legislation**. Such **contractors will** invariably **be quickly hired, poorly trained**, probably **low-bid**, **barely vetted and far more subject to bribery and corruption than permanent Government employees**. Not that bribery and corruption will necessarily be that necessary. **In short order, the system will be overwhelmed**. Whatever minimal **fraud detection and prevention safeguards** might be erected **won’t last long in the face of** hundreds of **thousands**, perhaps millions, **of applications** and petitions **to be adjudicated**. What that means is **the information** **provided** on those applications and petitions, and whatever supporting documents they may have (if any), **will** **essentially be taken at face value**. Whatever the applicant alien tells the adjudicator will essentially be taken at face value. **There will be little time or process available to verify anything**, perhaps **beyond running the** applicant’s **name** **through** a standard battery of **computer databases** (**and, even that may become so time consuming some will slip through the cracks**).

**Won’t net increase immigration**

**Benson 2** (Lenni B., Professor of Law – New York Law School, “Breaking Bureaucratic Borders: A Necessary Step Toward Immigration Law Reform”, Administrative Law Review, Winter, 54 ADMIN. L. REV. 203, Lexis)

**Many of the process failures arise from the failure of Congress** and the agencies **to adequately contend with the** internal and **external forces that shape the agency culture**. n313 Although many of these factors operate in other areas of administrative law, several are particularly strong in immigration law. The failure to plan for and counteract these forces, has directly contributed to the erosion of the essential process values. n313 See JAMES Q. WILSON, BUREAUCRACY: WHAT GOVERNMENT AGENCIES DO AND WHY THEY DO IT 91 (1989) ("Every organization has a culture, that is, a persistent, patterned way of thinking about the central tasks of and human relationship within an organization."). Wilson goes on to note that many organizations have multiple cultures and the relationship of the agency culture(s) to the agency mission may dramatically impact the effectiveness of the organization. See id. at 91-92. Here I am using culture in a broad manner to encompass both the internal and external forces that shape the organizations. a. Congressional Mandates and Dictated Priorities **Congress must bear a large part of the responsibility for the crisis in immigration adjudications**. n314 **Congress mandated** express and implied **priorities in the statutes** n315 **or demanded prioritization of specific programs with**  [\*283]  **the threat of reduced funding or of imposing new statutory mandates**. n316 For example, **some statutory limits force an allocation of resources to a particular visa category without adequate consideration of how the allocation might disadvantage or paralyze a separate function**. Two of the most obvious examples are the naturalization and H-1B petitions. When Congress pressures INS to reform and expedite its naturalization backlogs, the Service Centers move personnel away from the adjustment of status processing and the processing of the employment-based immigrant petitions. n317 The limitation of the total number of H-1B visas, necessitated that the INS put auditing procedures in place to be sure they did not approve more H-1B visas than the statute allowed. n318 Employers worrying about the cap filed large numbers of petitions in the winter and early spring to avoid being shut out of the category altogether. n319 Moving adjudicators to meet the thirty-day deadline meant other visa petitions had to sit waiting for adjudication. n314 Politics presents a treacherous double-edged sword for the INS' efficient and appropriate facilitation of immigration. The highly political debate persists about how vigorously the INS should control illegal immigration. When the INS engages in activities such as surprise work-site inspection, criticism immediately flows from immigrant groups and its conduct is subject to congressional scrutiny and investigation. Yet, on the other hand, if lawmakers perceive the INS as remiss in their duties, they immediately capitalize on the agency's unpopularity by encouraging resentment against it as congressional elections approach. A similar situation plagues other agencies, such as the IRS. See GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE PROJECT, supra note 12; see also Laurent, supra note 12, 13-18 (outlining Government Performance Project in detail). n315 See INA � 214(c)(2)(C), [8 U.S.C. � 1184](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=845bc4b6c417ccdc4e87d691d3f93c13&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b54%20ADMIN.%20L.%20REV.%20203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_butNum=160&_butInline=1&_butinfo=8%20USC%201184&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAA&_md5=be1c6ffa8f018c46af8a96c32dc7dfe1)(c)(2)(C) (1994 & Supp. V 1999) (mandating thirty day processing for H-1B and L-1 petitions). n316 See Dep'ts of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001: Hearing of the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Subcomm. of the Senate Appropriations Comm., 106th Cong. 183-213 (2000) (transcribing detailed questioning of how appropriated money to INS will be spent). n317 See supra text accompanying notes 183-85 and 215-16 (discussing current backlog problems). n318 See supra note 58 and accompanying text (noting numerical limitations imposed by statute). n319 Interview with Frances Berger, Attorney at Law, Law Office of Frances Berger, New York, N.Y. (July 8, 2000). **Although Congress did not intend the agency to suspend other operations, the management of the agency responded to congressional and community pressure**. However, the failure to adjudicate one type of petition means that pressure will mount in other categories or unnecessary work will be created. For example, if the immigrant petition cannot be processed in time, the employee will need a renewal of non-immigrant status. The extension petition could have been eliminated altogether if the INS had been able to process the I-140 in a timely fashion. The failure to adjudicate the adjustment of status applications meant that fewer people became permanent residents and a push to rush through cases created a bulge in the workflow. **The sudden increase in workload resulted in delayed processing**. **Delayed processing means the initial grants of work or travel authorization expire**. To obtain extensions of these, the individual must make a formal request and the INS has more work for its adjudication officers. n320 n320 See INS Nonimmigrant Classes, 8 C.F.R. � 214.2 (2000) (detailing general requirements for admission, extension, and maintenance of status). **One bulge can build into a tidal wave five years later**. In 1986, Congress authorized a legalization program resulting in more than three million people  [\*284]  becoming permanent residents over a five-year period. n321 Because permanent residents cannot apply for naturalization until they have completed five years of resident status, n322 the INS began to experience an upswing in the number of naturalization applications. n323 If the INS allows backlogs to grow, and then, through special initiatives, completes the adjustment of status applications for record numbers of people, the bulge will reappear a few years later in naturalization applications and in relative petitions for the employees' family members who have not yet immigrated to the United States.

**General – No HSW Shortage**

**Newest, most-qualified report says no shortage**

**Hickey 13**

[Walter, B.S. Applied Mathematics (William and Mary), Politics and Markets Reporter

Business Insider, “A Brand New Report Shows Just How Wrong Silicon Valley Is About A Tech Worker Shortage,” Business Insider, 5/31, <http://www.businessinsider.com/a-brand-new-report-shows-just-how-wrong-silicon-valleys-claim-of-a-stem-shortage-is-2013-5#ixzz2Wcm0nFLe>]

**A new report from the esteemed Georgetown Center on Education and the Workforce presents** a pretty significant rebuttal to that claim. ¶ Released on Wednesday, the annual report looks at how new college graduates are faring in the recession-era economy. ¶ That it's titled "Hard Times" should give **you a decent idea on how millennials are doing.** ¶ Most interesting is the technology sector numbers. **Were there truly a STEM shortage** — were demand for STEM majors to exceed supply — **one would expect that unemployment statistics for recent STEM graduates would be outstandingly low. ¶ The reality? Nope**. From the report:¶ Unemployment seems mostly concentrated in information systems (14.7 %) compared with computer science (8.7%) and mathematics (5.9%). As noted in an earlier report, **hiring tends to be slower for users of information compared to those who write programs and create software applications.**¶ Let's get a little perspective here. **According to the report, new information science graduates have worse unemployment than sociology (9.9%), archaeology (12.6%) and English (9.8%) majors**. ¶ Hard Times¶ What gives?¶ **If there's a STEM shortage, why are one in every eleven recent computer science graduates out of a job? Why are one in every seven information science majors out of work if Silicon Valley is so desperate to import talent?¶ The reality is that from an economic perspective we don't have a STEM shortage**.¶ What we may have is a "STEM majors who have the skills that Silicon Valley prefers" shortage.¶ But **to say we have a STEM shortage is needlessly hyperbolic.**

**Wages prove too and investor confidence alt cause**

**Spak 13**

[Kevin, economics reporter, “No, America Doesn't Have a Skilled Worker Shortage,” Newser, 5/6, http://www.newser.com/story/167457/no-america-doesnt-have-a-skilled-worker-shortage.html]

Employers have been complaining for years now **that the US is short of skilled workers**, which **is fast becoming the conventional wisdom** explanation for persistently high unemployment. After all, there are currently more job openings than our current unemployment rates would suggest there should be. "**There's only one problem with this story: It's mostly fiction**," writes Robert Samuelson at the Washington Post. **Most of these job postings are simply routine, the result of workers retiring or switching employers**.¶ **If there were really a skilled labor shortage, wages would be rising to lure workers away from the competition. Instead, manufacturing wages are up just 1%** since April 2012, **and computer programmer wages have been flat for a decade**. **The real explanation for high unemployment "almost certainly involves employers, not workers,**" Samuelson theorizes. **Businesses are reluctant to hire, thanks to some combination of skepticism about the recovery, ObamaCare raising labor costs, and a hunger for higher profit margins. "Today's crucial scarcity is not skills. It's confidence."**

**“Shortage” is** **merely employees wanting more money**

**Ozimek 13**

[Adam, journalist for Forbes, “An Alternative Theory of the Skills Shortage,” Forbes, 4/24, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/modeledbehavior/2013/04/24/an-alternative-theory-of-the-skills-shortage/>]

**A common story you hear now is that we are seeing a shortage of skilled workers.** It is argued that manufacturers and STEM employers in general are trying to hire skilled workers but can’t find them. **This is used sometimes as an argument for more skilled immigration,** and it’s used as a case for structural unemployment. A common counterargument to this is that if there was a shortage you would be seeing a rise in wages in these industries, but for STEM workers and manufacturers in general you don’t see rising wages, ergo there is no skill shortage. This is true of the normal definition of shortages, but **one possibility of what’s going on here is that those within these industries arguing that they have a shortage mean something slightly different than what economists mean**.¶ To put it concisely, I think **what people may be observing is very elastic labor demand**. Consider a manufacturing firm that is selling widgets in a global market. If they pay workers $15 an hour they can sell widgets for $1 and the global market will buy what from an individual firm’s perspective looks like pretty much however many they can make at that price. But at $15.50 an hour the widget cost and price goes up by one penny and they can sell zero on global market. This means the firm is willing to hire a marginal worker, and in fact many marginal workers for $15 an hour, but cannot profitably hire any more workers at more than that.¶ Technically **this isn’t a shortage, and is similar to what the “skills shortage” critics would say is just business owners wanting to pay below market cost**. But **it does explain why the “just raise the wages” solution doesn’t really help the industry. If it’s a zero economic profit industry and prices are set on a global market they may be unable to**.¶ So **what is there to complain about** then from industry’s perspective? **They want to pay wages below market and obviously nobody workers will accept that, so case closed, no skills gap**. But here are two suggestions for what “skills shortage” advocates may mean. First**, they may look at the $15 an hour job and know that this is a job that for many would be worth the investment it would take to learn the skills. Essentially they are trying to spread information about the jobs and complaining that the human capital industrial complex is suffering from a market failure**, partly due to an informational problem. **An informational problem they are trying to correct. Would the “skills shortage” critics you hear normally argue that human capital markets are fully rational and lacking in information problems and structural rigidities? Perhaps they should consider that is at work here even though we aren’t seeing rising wages**.

**Multiple studies prove our argument**

**Harrison 13**

[J.D, business reporter, “No shortage? New STEM data could derail entrepreneurs’ push for immigration changes,” Washington Post, 4/26, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-04-26/business/38828223\_1\_stem-fields-foreign-workers-senate-immigration-bill]

**New research on the labor market for science and technology graduates poses a threat to the lobbying efforts of** business owners and entrepreneurs, many of whom want **Congress to let more highly skilled workers in**to the United States.¶ One of their main arguments is that the country is not producing enough native-born workers in STEM fields — referring to science, technology, engineering and mathematics — to keep pace with surging demand from the private sector. Congress should therefore ease immigration restrictions, they argue, in order to help new and expanding businesses fill the void with foreign workers.¶ However, **a growing collection of research paints a starkly different picture of the STEM landscape in the U.S**. **The latest study comes from the Economic Policy Institute**, a left-leaning think tank, which this week **published a report suggesting the skills gap is a myth.¶ The EPI study found that the United States has ‘more than a sufficient supply of workers available to work in STEM occupations.’ Basic dynamics of supply and demand would dictate that if there were a domestic labor shortage, wages should have risen. Instead, researchers found, they’ve been flat, with many Americans holding STEM degrees unable to enter the field and a sharply higher share of foreign workers taking jobs** in the information technology industry.¶ The study showed that only half of students graduating in STEM fields from U.S. universities find jobs in their respective fields of expertise. In one instance, nearly a third of computer science graduates who did not enter the industry said jobs were not available — echoing complaints from many American graduates that a flood of foreign workers has crippled their job prospects after college.¶ **It’s not the first study to suggest that the widely cited “STEM shortage” is at least overstated, if not completely non-existent**. Six months ago, **the Boston Consulting Group released a report showing that the country had a minor skills shortage in some fields, but nothing significant enough to support an immigration overhaul.¶ The findings bode poorly for** many in the private sector, as technology executives and entrepreneurs have led a campaign to expand the country’s H-1B program, which offers a temporary work visa to highly skilled foreigners, often those in STEM fields. **A Senate immigration bill** includes many of their proposed changes; in particular, it would raise the annual cap on H-1Bs from 65,000 to as high as 180,000.

**It’s a questions of employers not workers**

**Samuelson 13**

[Bob, Business and economics journalist, “Skilled Worker Shortage Mostly a Myth,” U-T San Diego, 5/5, <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2013/May/05/samuelson-skilled-worker-shortage-myth/2/?#article-copy>]

So, **what explains more vacancies** at given unemployment levels (aka the shifting Beveridge curve)? **The answer almost certainly involves employers, not workers**. **Businesses have become more risk-averse. They’re more reluctant to hire. They’ve raised standards. For many reasons, they’ve become more demanding and discriminating. These** reasons could **include (a) doubts about the recovery; (b) government policies raising labor costs** (example: the Affordable Care Act’s insurance mandates); (c) **unwillingness to pay for training; and (d) fear of squeezed profits**. In practice, motives mix.¶ **The chief victims of this shift in business behavior seem to be the long-term unemployed** (more than six months), as **some fascinating research by economists** William Dickens and Rand Ghayad of Northeastern University **suggests**. By their estimates, **virtually all the reduction in hiring falls on this group, regardless of their other characteristics** (age, education, industry experience). Many **firms seem to have concluded that the long-term jobless are damaged goods.**¶ To test this, Ghayad emailed fake resumes to hundreds of firms in response to job postings. All the fictional candidates were 2005 college graduates with identical skills; they differed only in their length of unemployment (0-12 months) and experience in the hiring industry. The long-term unemployed received few responses. In many cases, software filters apparently eliminated their applications automatically. Similarly, six months of joblessness erased the value of industry experience. **Employers preferred candidates with less joblessness over those who had worked in their industry**.¶ No doubt the economy’s future would be brighter if workers had more skills. But **we shouldn’t mistake a long-term goal for a short-term problem. The idea of widespread labor shortages in an era of high unemployment seems absurd — and is. Today’s crucial scarcity is not skills. It’s confidence.**

**New immigrants not key---immigration and visas already increasing**

**Porter 2-5 –** Eduardo Porter, writer for the New York Times, February 5th, 2013, "Immigration Reform Issue: The Effect on the Budget" [www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/business/immigration-reform-issue-the-effect-on-the-budget.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/business/immigration-reform-issue-the-effect-on-the-budget.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print)

Yet immigration reform today means something quite different than it did in 2007. Notably, the elements needed to stop the flow of illegal immigrants north are much less important to the enterprise. The Obama administration has already spent huge amounts of money on border enforcement. Today, border policing costs about $18 billion a year — nearly 50 percent more than it did in 2006. And deportations have soared. What’s more, illegal immigration has slowed to a trickle, as Mexico has grown more robustly than the United States. The illegal immigrant population has even been **shrinking** in the last few years. And it may continue to do so as the Mexican population of prime migration-age people stops growing.¶ Also, many employers have already gotten some of what they wanted: the number of workers entering the United States on temporary visas for low-end jobs in **agriculture** and other industries has increased sharply.¶ “The discussion is in a different environment,” said Gordon H. Hanson, an expert on the economics of immigration at the University of California, San Diego. “**The flow of new immigrants is not the story anymore.”**

**(--) No shortage of skilled workers—we can solve the impact now:**

Robert X. **Cringely**, 10/23/20**12** (staff writer, “What Americans don’t know about H-1B visas could hurt us all,” <http://www.cringely.com/2012/10/23/what-americans-dont-know-about-h-1b-visas-could-hurt-us-all/>, Accessed 1/23/2013, )

**A key argument for H-1B has always been that there’s a shortage of technical talent in U.S. IT**. This has been taken as a given by both major political parties. But it’s wrong. Here are **six rigorous studies** (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) that **show there is no shortage of STEM workers in the U.S. nor the likelihood of such a shortage in years to come**.¶ You may recall a recent column here where the IT community in Memphis, TN proved there was no labor shortage in that technology hotbed.¶ **The whole labor shortage argument is total hogwash.** Yes, there is a labor shortage at substandard wages.

**(--) No skilled worker shortage—skill deficiencies of current workforce are overstated:**

Ed **Crego,** 7/19/20**12** (“The Skilled Worker Shortage Fallacy,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/george-munoz-frank-islam-and-ed-crego/the-skilled-worker-shorta_b_1677881.html>, Accessed 1/23/2013, )

**America has a serious shortage of skilled workers and that is a primary cause of our lack of job creation. Right? Wrong!**¶ We have been bemused for the past few years as an ecumenical group of business leaders, academics and experts have put forward the argument that training and developing a more skilled workforce would help drive job creation. It seems to us that this is a basic misunderstanding of cause and effect.¶ We can have a philosophical debate about which came first -- the chicken or the egg. But when it comes to job creation there should be no such argument. Organizations and individuals who create new organizations are the chicken -- they are the job creators. Employees and skilled workers are the eggs -- they are the job holders.¶ That's not to say that we don't need skilled workers in the United States. But, **as a wide variety of recent studies have demonstrated, the extent to which the skills of the workforce influences business decisions is a modest one and the actual "skill deficiencies" of the current American workforce may be significantly overstated.**

**General – No HSW Solvency**

**Even if you’re right about H-1Bs, Gang of 8 Bill wrecks the program**

**Sherk 13**

[James, Senior Policy Analyst in Labor Economics at the Heritage Foundation, “Immigration: Gang of Eight Would Make H-1B Program Unworkable,” Heritage Foundry, 5/20, <http://blog.heritage.org/2013/05/20/immigration-gang-of-eight-would-make-h-1b-program-unworkable/>]

Supporters of the Gang of Eight immigration bill argue they want to make immigrating legally simpler, but **their bill would make the H-1B system** for highly skilled workers almost **unworkable**.¶ H-1B visas allow U.S. companies to hire highly educated foreign workers for occupations requiring specialized skills and knowledge. Employers must pay H-1B workers the “prevailing wage” and certify that their employment will not adversely affect other employees. This allows companies to expand and create more jobs for American workers as well.¶ **Section 4211 of the Gang of Eight bill guts the H-1B program by imposing heavy new restrictions**. **It would force employers** using H-1B visas **to:¶ Pay higher wages** to most H-1B employees than to U.S. workers;¶ **Advertise the job for at least 30 days** in a Department of Labor online database;¶ **Offer the job to any “equally or better qualified” American** who applies;¶ **Not displace any of their U.S. employees for a six-month window** surrounding the H-1B visa application unless they can show that they have not decreased the number of workers in the same “job zone” for the past year; **and¶ Follow even stricter regulations if more than 15 percent of their workforce uses the program.¶ Forcing businesses to pay H-1B workers above-market wages is bad enough. The other restrictions would create a bureaucratic nightmare for employers and put them in legal jeopardy**. For instance, **how can an employer prove that it has offered the job to all “equally qualified” American applicants except by choosing them** over the H-1B worker? **Qualifications are inherently subjective**. They depend on a business’s unique needs and a worker’s unique skills. **Nonetheless, employers would have to objectively prove**—according to the Department of Labor’s standards—that each H-1B hire had better qualifications than every rejected American applicant.¶ **The “non-displacement” requirement forces H-1B employers to prove that each employee who quit was not effectively discharged** and that performance problems fully justified any layoffs. Again, **the Department of Labor would establish the standards for evaluating such personnel actions.¶ The government lacks the information necessary to make these subjective judgments**. **Every business with H-1B employees would risk legal liability. Abusive government agents could easily argue that an American worker had the same qualifications as a foreign applicant and levy stiff fines.** The IRS scandal demonstrates why businesses do not trust the government not to abuse such authority.¶ Rather than face this legal uncertainty and endure restrictions on their personnel actions, **many employers would stop using the H-1B program altogether.** **This happened when Congress applied similar** “recruitment and non-displacement” **requirements to financial institutions** that received bailout funds. **Rather than comply, the affected businesses dropped out of the H-1B program and rescinded existing job offers**.¶ The H-1B program allows companies to fill vital highly skilled positions—and keep their operations in America. It benefits American workers and businesses. **Congress should not make the H-1B system for highly skilled immigrants nearly unmanageable.**

**Visas inevitable regardless of PC**

**Yglesias 1/15** Matthew, Slate, 2013, How the GOP Can Roll Obama on Immigration, [www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2013/01/15/immigration\_reform\_will\_obama\_get\_rolled.html](http://www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2013/01/15/immigration_reform_will_obama_get_rolled.html)

Of the major policy issues under discussion in Washington, "immigration reform" stands out for having unusually undefined content. For the major immigration-advocacy groups, the goal is clear, a comprehensive bill that includes a path to citizenship for the overwhelming majority of unauthorized migrants already living in the United States. But many other aspects of immigration law are in the mix as part of a proposed deal, and it seems to me that there's a fair chance that a nimble Republican Party could essentially roll the Democratic coalition and pass an "immigration reform" bill that doesn't offer the path Latino advocacy groups are looking for.¶ Elise Foley has the key line from her briefing on the administration's thinking about immigration, namely that a piecemeal approach "could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants."¶ And indeed it could. But how can they stop it? The last House GOP effort to split the high-tech visas question from the path to citizenship question was an absurd partisan ploy. If Republicans want to get serious about it they should be able to make it work. The centerpiece would be something on increased immigration of skilled workers. That's something the tech industry wants very much, it's a great idea on the merits, **and few influential people have any** real **beef with it.** High tech visas will easily generate revenue to pay for some stepped-up enforcement. Then instead of adding on a poison pill so Democrats will block the bill, you need to add a sweetener. Not the broad path to citizenship, but something small like the DREAM Act. Now you've got a package that falls massively short of what Latino groups are looking for, but that I think **Dem**ocrat**s** **will have a hard time** actually **blocking**. After all, why would they block it? It packages three things—more skilled immigration, more enforcement, and help for DREAMers—they say they want. Blocking it because it doesn't also do the broad amnesty that liberals want and conservatives hate would require the kind of fanaticism that is the exact opposite of Obama's approach to politics.

**Reform fails to solve- would restrict student visas**

**Tiger 8** (Joseph, J.D. Candidate – Georgetown University Law Center, “Re-Bending the Paperclip: An Examination of America's Policy Regarding Skilled Workers and Student Visas”, Georgetown Immigration Law Journal, Spring, 22 Geo. Immigr. L.J. 507, Lexis)

**Offering** all **students green cards but not H-1B visas would be** even more **problematic**. **If** all **students were** made automatically **eligible for EB status** upon graduation, **acceptance at an American university would**, in essence, **constitute a** near **guarantee of** future **citizenship**. Thus, **to maintain** its **power to control citizenship, the government** **would** have to **exercise** **even stricter control** **over** the granting of **student visas. These** **procedural hurdles** **could act as a** **disincentive** **if not an** **actual barrier** **to foreign students interested in studying at American universities**. [197](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1f2ac663891be9007c60456388cf650b&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAz&_md5=488a84a2b89647170f6bf00d5b099a35" \l "n197" \t "_blank) Additionally, working under a green card has procedural hurdles of its own, not associated with the H-1B visa program (notably, labor certification). As such, foreign students who do not wish to stay in the United States beyond a temporary period of work would face the choice of accepting the green card and becoming a permanent resident, or leaving immediately upon the termination of F-1 status.

**No solvency- increasing skilled workers trades-off with effectiveness**

**Wasem 10** (Ruth Ellen, Specialist in Immigration Policy – Congressional Research Service, “U.S. Immigration Policy on Permanent Admissions”, CRS Report, 4-1, http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?art icle=1729&context=key\_workplace)

**Substantial efforts to reform legal immigration have failed** in the recent past, **prompting some to characterize the issue as a “zero-sum game”** or a “third rail.” **The challenge inherent in reforming legal immigration is balancing employers’ hopes to increase the supply of legally present foreign workers**, families’ longing to re-unite and live together, **and a widely shared wish among the various stakeholders to improve the policies governing legal immigration into the country**. **Whether the Congress will act to alter immigration policies**—either in the form of comprehensive immigration reform or in the form of incremental revisions aimed at strategic changes—**is at the crux of the debate**. Addressing these contentious policy reforms against the backdrop of high unemployment sharpens the social and business cleavages and may narrow the range of options.

**General – xo solves 2ac**

**Executive actions solves**

**Kumar 3/19** (Anita, “Obama turning to executive power to get what he wants”, 2013, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2013/03/19/186309/obama-turning-to-executive-power.html#storylink=cpy>, CMR)

WASHINGTON — President Barack Obama came into office four years ago skeptical of pushing the power of the White House to the limit, especially if it appeared to be circumventing Congress.¶ Now, as he launches his second term, **Obama has grown more comfortable wielding power to try to move his own agenda forward, particularly when a deeply fractured, often**-**hostile Congress gets in his way.**¶ **He’s done it with a package of tools**, some of which date to George Washington and some invented in the modern era of an increasingly powerful presidency. **And** he’s done it with **a frequency that belies his original campaign criticisms of** predecessor George W. **Bush**, invites criticisms that he’s bypassing the checks and balances of Congress and the courts, **and whets the appetite of liberal activists who want him to do even more to advance their goals.**¶ While his decision to send drones to kill U.S. citizens suspected of terrorism has garnered a torrent of criticism, his use of executive orders and other powers at home is deeper and wider.¶ **He delayed the deportation of young illegal immigrants when Congress wouldn’t agree**. He ordered the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to research gun violence, which Congress halted nearly 15 years ago. He told the Justice Department to stop defending the Defense of Marriage Act, deciding that the 1996 law defining marriage as between a man and a woman was unconstitutional. He’s vowed to act on his own if Congress didn’t pass policies to prepare for climate change.¶ Arguably more than any other president in modern history, **he’s using executive actions**, primarily orders, **to bypass** or pressure a **Congress where the opposition Republicans can block any proposal**.¶ “**It’s gridlocked** **and** **dysfunctional. The place is a mess**,” **said** Rena **Steinzor, a law professor at** the University of **Maryland**. “I think (**executive action) is an inevitable tool given what’s happened**.”¶ **Now that Obama has showed a willingness to use those tactics, advocacy groups, supporters and even members of Congress are lobbying him to do so more and more**.¶ The Center for Progressive Reform, a liberal advocacy group composed of law professors, including Steinzor, has pressed Obama to sign seven executive orders on health, safety and the environment during his second term.¶ Seventy environmental groups wrote a letter urging the president to restrict emissions at existing power plants.¶ Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D-Md., the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, sent a letter to the White House asking Obama to ban federal contractors from retaliating against employees who share salary information.¶ Gay rights organizations recently demonstrated in front of the White House to encourage the president to sign an executive order to bar discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity by companies that have federal contracts, eager for Obama to act after nearly two decades of failed attempts to get Congress to pass a similar bill.¶ “It’s ridiculous that we’re having to push this hard for the president to simply pick up a pen,” said Heather Cronk, the managing director of the gay rights group GetEQUAL. “It’s reprehensible that, after signing orders on gun control, cybersecurity and all manner of other topics, the president is still laboring over this decision.”¶ The White House didn’t respond to repeated requests for comment.¶ In January, Obama said he continued to believe that legislation was “sturdier and more stable” than executive actions, but that sometimes they were necessary, such as his January directive for the federal government to research gun violence.¶ “There are certain issues where **a judicious use of executive power can move the argument forward or solve problems that are of immediate-enough import that we can’t afford not to do it**,” the former constitutional professor told The New Republic magazine.

**General – xo solves 1ar**

**Obama can solve immigration unilaterally**

**Lillis 2/16** Mike, “Dems: Obama can act unilaterally on immigration reform”, thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/administration/283583-dems-recognize-that-obama-can-act-unilaterally-on-immigration-reform, (accessed by CMR on February 16th, 2013)

President **Obama can – and will – take steps on immigration** reform **in the event Congress doesn't reach a comprehensive deal this year**, according to several House Democratic leaders.¶ While the Democrats are hoping Congress will preclude any executive action by enacting reforms legislatively, they say **the administration has the tools to move unilaterally if the bipartisan talks** on Capitol Hill **break down**. Furthermore, they say, **Obama stands poised to use them**.¶ "I don't think the president will be hands off on immigration for any moment in time," Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), the head of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters this week. "**He's ready to move forward if we're not.**"¶ Rep. Joseph Crowley (N.Y.), vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, echoed that message, saying **Obama is "not just beating the drum**," for immigration reform, "**he's** actually **the drum major**."¶ "There are limitations as to what he can do with executive order," Crowley said Wednesday, "but **he did say** that **if Congress continued to fail** to act that **he would take steps and measures to enact common-sense executive orders** to move this country forward."¶ Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), who heads the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said **there are "plenty" of executive steps Obama could take if Congress fails to pass a reform package**. "The huge one," Grijalva said, is "the **waiving** of **deportation**" in order **to keep families together**.¶ "Four million of the undocumented [immigrants] are people who overstayed their visas to stay with family," he said Friday. "So that would be, I think, an area in which … **there's a great deal of executive authority** that he could deal with."¶ **The administration could** also **waive visa caps**, Grijalva said, **to ensure** that **industries** like agriculture **have ample access to** low-skilled **labor**.¶ "**Everybody's for getting the smart and the talented in**, but there's also a labor flow issue," he said.¶ To be sure, Obama and congressional Democrats would prefer the reforms to come through Congress – both because that route would solidify the changes into law and because it would require bipartisan buy-in.¶ Still, House Republicans have been loath to accept one of the central elements of Obama's strategy: A pathway to citizenship for the estimated 11-12 million undocumented people currently living in the country – a move which many conservatives deem "amnesty."¶ Indeed, when the House Judiciary Committee met earlier this month on immigration reform, much of the discussion focused on whether there is some middle ground between citizenship and mass deportation.¶ “If we can find a solution that is … short of a pathway to citizenship, but better than just kicking 12 million people out, why is that not a good solution?” Rep. Raul Labrador (R-Idaho) asked during the hearing.¶ Obama on Tuesday spent a good portion of his State of the Union address urging Congress to send him a comprehensive immigration reform bill this year. Central to that package, he said, should be provisions for "strong border security," for "establishing a responsible pathway to earned citizenship" and for "fixing the legal immigration system to cut waiting periods and attract the highly-skilled entrepreneurs and engineers that will help create jobs and grow our economy."¶ "We know what needs to be done," Obama said. "So let’s get this done."¶ Becerra said he and other immigration reformers have had two meetings with the White House on immigration this month, one with the executive team working on the issue and, more recently, with Obama himself. Becerra said administration officials "essentially" know what reforms they want – "and they have communicated that to both House and Senate members, bipartisanly" – but they also want Congress to take the lead.¶ "They're giving Congress a chance to work its will to move this," Becerra said. "But … I don't think he's going to wait too long.¶ "If you were to ask him would he be prepared to submit a bill if Congress isn't ready … he would tell you, I have no doubt, 'I can do it in a heartbeat,'" Becerra added. "**The president will move forward where he can if Congress doesn't act."**¶ Indeed, **Obama has already shown a willingness to do just that**. Last summer, just months before November's elections, **Obama shocked political observers when he launched a program through the** Department of Homeland Security (**DHS) allowing undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children to remain without threat of deportation**. The two-year "deferred action" was modeled on the Dream Act legislation that has been unable to pass Congress.¶ **The change was not an executive order, but** an extension of "**prosecutorial discretion**" on the part of the DHS.¶ Although conservatives howled about administrative overreach, Obama's gamble paid off, as the president won more than 70 percent of the Hispanic vote at the polls – a margin that has fueled the drive for immigration reform this year, as GOP leaders are anxious to avoid a similar divide in 2016.¶ Grijalva said the **expansion of** the **deferred action** program **represents another opportunity for Obama to move immigration reform administratively.**

**President has wide authority – solves the impact\*\*\***

**Kerwin** et al., March 20**11** [Donald M Kerwin, VP for Programs at the Migration Policy Institute, “Executive Action on Immigration”, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/administrativefixes.pdf>, CMR]

It is now commonplace to describe the nation’s immigration system as broken. The presence of 11 million unauthorized residents – almost 30 percent of the nation’s foreign-born population – vividly illustrates the problem. **Congress has failed** in successive efforts **over several years to enact reforms.** **Whether reform initiatives move ahead or stall in this new Congress**, **a wide body of immigration law is on the books**, **executive-branch agencies administer and enforce those laws daily, and** approximately **1 million people immigrate legally** to the United States **each year.** In short, current laws and actions taken by immigration officials affect millions of lives anually. **In the absence of legislation**, **the locus for policy action increasingly resides in the executive branch**, **intensifying the imperative for policies,** programs, and procedures **that are effective and fair in advancing the core goals of the nation’s immigration system: promoting family unity, meeting legitimate labor market needs, offering protection** from persecution, **and awarding US citizenship** as an important step toward full incorporation into US society. Achieving these goals depends on effective immigration enforcement that ensures both border and national security, economic competitiveness, community safety, and a level playing field for American workers.

**A2: Bioweapons**

**Zero solvency**

**TAH 2009**. “Ready or not?: Protecting the publics health from diseases, disasters and bioterrorism” Trust for Americas Health, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. <http://healthyamericans.org/reports/bioterror09/pdf/TFAHReadyorNot200906.pdf>

While federal preparedness policy has evolved over the past seven years with the passage of major legislation and a renewed focus on accountability and transparency, a review of federal policies by TFAH finds that the federal government continues to lag in several key areas: Funding: The U.S. Congress has failed to deliver a sustained financial commitment towards preparedness -- especially at the state and local level where many of the essential preparedness and response activities occur. While the President and Congress should be applauded for providing more than $7.7 billion in emergency supplemental funding to respond to the H1N1 outbreak this fall, with a bulk of that funding going toward the development and purchase of vaccines, we cannot be prepared for the range of threats we as a nation face when we rely on a band aid approach to funding emergency preparedness; National Stockpiles: The President and Congress need to plan for the replenishment of the Strategic National Stockpile (SNS). In addition to the antivirals distributed to fight H1N1, other medical countermeasures in the SNS are beginning to pass their shelf-life expiration date. Current legislation, however, does not allow for replenishing the stockpile, nor does it factor in the storage, security, and maintenance costs associated with the SNS; and Biosurveillance: Real-time disease detection and surveillance is crucial for a well-prepared public health and medical response system. While there has been an increased focus on biosurveillance and the need to coordinate across government agencies, the nation’s human health surveillance systems remain a patchwork.

**A2: Econ**

**Won’t solve the economy**

**Scruggs 2/23** (Mike, “Immigration Myths: propping up foolish immigration policies”, <http://www.thetribunepapers.com/2013/02/23/immigration-myths-propping-up-foolish-immigration-policies/>, CMR)

Employment is the great magnet for illegal immigration. **Many CIS studies and the work of Harvard labor economist** George **Borjas confirm that**, although there are many notable exceptions, taken as a whole the last several decades of **immigrants are not really adding to the economy**. **They** add to the profits of those who employ cheap imported labor, but they **are displacing American workers**, **and their numbers are creating an excess labor supply driving American wages down.** **This is particularly acute for Americans with a high school education or less** and becoming a problem at higher skill levels. That is the reason American workers are not benefiting from top-line economic growth. As Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation has pointed out, **the excessive number of unskilled and poorly educated immigrants**—about 80 percent of the total—**has created a considerable fiscal drag** on federal, state, and local governments, and taxpayers. The Federation of Americans for Immigration Reform (FAIR) estimates this to be about $100 billion per year considering ONLY education, healthcare, and law enforcement. There are other significant but less easily quantified burdens impacting society as well.

**Doesn’t solve econ– immigration impact negligible**

Steve **Malanga** is a Contributing Editor to City Journal and a Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute., Summer **2006**, How Unskilled Immigrants Hurt Our Economy, <http://www.city-journal.org/html/16_3_immigrants_economy.html>

**As foreign competition and mechanization shrink manufacturing and farmworker jobs, low-skilled immigrants are likely to wind up farther on the margins of our economy**, where many already operate. For example, although only about 12 percent of construction workers are foreign-born, 100,000 to 300,000 illegal immigrants have carved a place for themselves as temporary workers on the fringes of the industry. In urban areas like New York and Los Angeles, these mostly male illegal immigrants gather on street corners, in empty lots, or in Home Depot parking lots to sell their labor by the hour or the day, for $7 to $11 an hour. That’s far below what full-time construction workers earn, and for good reason. Unlike the previous generations of immigrants who built America’s railroads or great infrastructure projects like New York’s bridges and tunnels, these day laborers mostly do home-improvement projects. A New York study, for instance, found that four in ten employers who hire day laborers are private homeowners or renters wanting help with cleanup chores, moving, or landscaping. Another 56 percent were contractors, mostly small, nonunion shops, some owned by immigrants themselves, doing short-term, mostly residential work. The day laborer’s market, in other words, has turned out to be a boon for homeowners and small contractors offering their residential clients a rock-bottom price, but a big chunk of the savings comes because low-wage immigration has produced such a labor surplus that many of these workers are willing to take jobs without benefits and with salaries far below industry norms. **Because so much of our legal and illegal immigrant labor is concentrated in such fringe, low-wage employment, its overall impact on our economy is extremely small**. **A 1997 National Academy of Sciences study estimated that immigration’s net benefit to the American economy raises the average income of the native-born by only some $10 billion a year—about $120 per household. And that meager contribution is not the result of immigrants helping to build our essential industries or making us more competitive globally but instead merely delivering our pizzas and cutting our grass.** Estimates by pro-immigration forces that foreign workers contribute much more to the economy, boosting annual gross domestic product by hundreds of billions of dollars, generally just tally what immigrants earn here, while ignoring the offsetting effect they have on the wages of native-born workers.

**A2: Indian Relations**

**US-India relations resilient- CIR not enough to spillover**

**Desai 12** Fellow, Truman National Security Project (Ronak. “US-India Relations under the 2nd obama administration.” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ronak-d-desai/usindia-relations-under-t_b_2115396.html>)

**What's ahead for US-India relations** now that President Obama has won reelection? With **ties** between Washington and New Delhi continuing to **flourish** over the past four years, the US-India bilateral partnership will likely be characterized by continuity and **growth during a second Obama term**. The fundamental **pillars underlying** President Obama's foreign **policy towards India**--strengthening **security and military cooperation**, boosting **trade, and** encouraging New Delhi's **collaboration** on various regional and global issues--will **remain largely intact.¶** The US-India strategic partnership has thrived during Obama's first administration. Initial concerns from some Indian officials that the newly elected president would "re-hyphenate" relations with New Delhi, prioritize ties with China, insert the US in the Kashmir dispute, and view India exclusively through an Af/Pak lens proved unfounded. On the contrary, President Obama quickly established himself a reliable champion of the bilateral relationship which witnessed Washington and New Delhi expand their engagement in a number of substantive areas.¶ On the security front, cooperation reached unprecedented levels under Obama's first term. **The United States now conducts more military exercises with India than with any other country in the world,** while **counter-terrorism** and intelligence collaboration between the two **has increased** dramatically following the infamous November 2008 Mumbai terror attacks. President **Obama** **has also taken significant steps to relax export-controls to India to allow New Delhi greater access to advanced US technology**. Additionally, since 2008, the Obama Administration has approved the sale of more than $8 billion in military equipment from US defense suppliers to New Delhi. Administration officials have described India as the "linchpin" of its strategic rebalancing towards Asia and are relying on New Delhi to play a greater role stabilizing Afghanistan once the US begins its military withdrawal there.¶ Economically, **trade with India is on track to cross the $100 billion** mark for the first time, US investment in the country has skyrocketed compared to just a decade ago, and **the two** **sides have worked to conclude a** US-India **Bilateral Investment Treaty** that would further bolster their economic relationship.¶These positive trends will likely continue during a second Obama administration. Although the basic contours of US-India ties remain unchanged, reflecting the potent durability of the bilateral relationship, this is not to say that the two countries are in perfect harmony with one another on every issue.¶ As President Obama embarks on a second term, **Washington will want New Delhi to** **continue reducing its dependence on Iranian oil,** implement significant **economic reforms** that eliminate barriers to foreign investment, **and modify liability legislation** enacted by the Indian parliament that has precluded the United States and India from realizing the full benefits of the landmark US-India Civilian Nuclear Agreement. President George W. Bush signed the historic accord with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh in 2005 and President Obama moved to quickly implement the deal by concluding a reprocessing agreement with India shortly after taking office.¶ **New Delhi**, for its part, **will want Washington to resolve the Iran question** exclusively through non-military means, resist entering into any formal security pact with the United States that would appear to compromise its inviolable strategic autonomy, **and press Washington to make it easier for Indian tech workers to obtain visas** to come to the United States.¶ Yet **none of these issues--or any other differences that may remain between the two sides--is capable of arresting the overall upward trajectory of US-India relations. Areas of convergence far exceed areas of disagreement, indicating that earlier misgivings by some observers that bilateral ties had been oversold have been misguided.**¶ President **Obama has established himself as an able** and effective **custodian** of the US-India strategic partnership. Although the bipartisan consensus that has emerged in Washington around the importance of deepening ties with India would suggest that US engagement with New Delhi would have continued regardless of whether he had won reelection, President Obama is uniquely well positioned to strengthen the US-India relationship during his second-term. His **enduring popularity within India, close relationship with** Manmohan **Singh,** **and** widespread **support amongst the Indian-American community are just some** of the **distinctive factors** that will help ensure ties with New Delhi remain robust and continue to grow over the next four years. If the past is any indicator of what's on the horizon, the future looks bright for US-India relations.

**Relations won’t collapse over Visa policy**

**Daily News and Analysis 10** [“U.S. politicians are trying to save their jobs”]

New York’s Democrat senator Charles Schumer calls Infosys a ‘chop shop’. **The US government hikes visa fees for Indian companies which employ more than 50% of H1B** and L1 **visa holders**. President Barack Obama asserts that his policies will ensure American jobs do not any more go to China, India or Germany. **Do these smoke signals add up to a serious crisis point for Indo-US relations? Probably not**. These straws should be seen as nothing more than a political game which has marginal economic significance for the two countries. **Indo-US business relations are nowhere near the brink, and they do not spell doom for either side immediately or in the future.**  It has been customary in India to read a little too much into every American posture in the business arena, but the time has come to treat American politicians in the same way that we do our ours — with amusement, if not disdain. It is not surprising that American politicians make the usual loud and ineffective noises about saving American jobs. They are actually trying to save their own jobs.

**-- No collapse --- none of their evidence is good enough --- visas are an irritant in relations, but not the key issue --- won’t destroy overall cooperation --- its resilient**

**Fernandes 2** (George, Defense Minister – India, “Weighing Inspections”, The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, 8-28, Lexis)

GEORGE FERNANDES, Defense Minister, India: Well, I don't think they should have had these earlier advisories asking people not to go. There was no situation that warranted that. SIMON MARKS: George Fernandes is India's defense minister. He says he's still optimistic that **the** new **U.S.-Indian relationship will survive any obstacles it encounters**. GEORGE FERNANDES: Our relations with the United States is based on mutual trust and transparency, and naturally, we should be together in fighting all common causes. **There may be areas where there are differences**. On... there could be differences and nuances, there could be differences **in** some ba**sic issues, there could be disputes on trade-related matters**. **There are bound to be hiccups in relationships, but I don't think the** kind of **relationship** that we have today **between the** **U**nited **S**tates **and India** is something that **can be derailed by anyone**. SIMON MARKS: After decades of talking past one another, the world's most powerful democracy is now working closely with the world's largest. **Economic and geopolitical changes have helped lure the U**nited **S**tates **and India closer together. It's a relationship with even more potential for growth** as both sides learn to trust one another.

**-- India won’t cooperate. U.S. concessions are irrelevant.**

**Karl 10** (David J., President – Asia Strategy Initiative, “US-India Relations: It's a Two-Way Street”, Asia Sentinel, 4-30, http://www.asiasentinel.com/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=2434&Itemid=376)

**Criticism of Obama ignores New Delhi's inability to get it together** The **Obama** administration **has drawn** much **criticism for** its perceived **indifference to** America's allies and friends in Asia and Europe. A good deal of this criticism has focused on the specific case of **India**. In the view of quite a number of U.S. observers, President Obama is taking New Delhi for granted, squandering the deep reservoir of diplomatic goodwill that his predecessor so assiduously built up. **Some** have even **sounded the alarm that Obama is "losing India,"** while others caution that the negligent treatment is pushing New Delhi closer to Moscow and Beijing. **But part** of the reason for Washington's languid engagement with New Delhi **has to do with** nagging **doubts that India can deliver on dramatic initiatives**, **and there is good reason for this doubt** In India, elites had grown accustomed to the pride of place the country enjoyed just so recently in Washington's strategic calculus. Obama's honeymoon with India was virtually non-existent. Even before he took office, one could hear rumblings of unease about his commitment to the civilian nuclear agreement, his stance on corporate out-sourcing, or his willingness to re-hyphenate India and Pakistan in U.S. policy calculations. As Obama was being inaugurated, then-Foreign Secretary Shiv Shankar Menon (and current national security advisor to Prime Minister Manmohan Singh) was even reported as having publicly expressed his apprehensions about the new administration. Things have not improved since. The Indian commentariat took umbrage when Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton decided not to include India in her inaugural tour of Asia in February 2009. (This despite the fact New Delhi's leaders were about to plunge into parliamentary elections and it is unclear whether her visit would have served any substantive purpose.) By May 2009, one analyst concluded that "there [is] no mistaking the thrill in gone" in bilateral relations. More recently, others have exclaimed that **mistrust of** President **Obama "pervades the Indian establishment"** or have warned of foreboding "storms ahead in the Indo-U.S. strategic partnership." Observing that **Indian memories are long and snubs never forgotten**, a leading journalist warns of rising public resentment against the United States. As far as it goes, much in the critique about the Obama approach rings true. To date, the administration has been long on rhetoric about bilateral affairs but short on concrete deliverables. There is no question that the President is sincere about cultivating Indian friendship. At last November's summit meeting with Prime Minister Singh, the White House, for example, pulled out all the stops in hosting an elegant state dinner in Mr. Singh's honor. But the summit is remembered more for the antics of its party-crashers than for any substantive outcome. To be sure, President Obama has entrusted management of the India portfolio to two senior Cabinet members with special bonds to the country: Secretary Clinton, who is a staunch India-phile and speaks often of taking relations to a higher plane, and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, who spent five years of his childhood in India. But it remains to be seen whether Clinton has the heft inside the administration and Geithner enough room on his crowded agenda to move headline-grabbing initiatives forward. The meager outcome of Geithner's trip to India last month only underscores this concern. All in all, it is a fair judgment that the Obama administration has not yet displayed much interest in continuing its predecessor's high-profile engagement with New Delhi. Even the just-concluded agreement on nuclear fuel reprocessing is more about tending to unfinished business than striking out in creative new directions. While much of **the critique** against Obama is valid, it also **misses the other side of the equation**. **New Delhi**, too, **bears part of the blame for the inertia in bilateral affairs**. **One cannot have a** private **discussion** these days with US officials responsible for India policy **without detecting nagging doubts about New Delhi's eagerness to take on bold bilateral projects**. Indeed, it seems that **the unexpectedly arduous debate** in New Delhi two years ago **about the** civilian **nuclear accord**, intended to be a cornerstone of the new era of relations, has **had the** ironic **effect of sapping the readiness of officials** in both capitals **to invest political capital in** ambitious **bilateral undertakings**. As the Washington Post noted during the debate, "if New Delhi's politicians cannot find a way to say yes to such a clearly advantageous agreement with a natural ally, the next US administration no doubt will think twice before trying anything like it." Of course, Prime Minister Singh finally did manage to push the nuclear accord through the Indian parliament, but only after a long and bruising debate that revealed the depth of opposition to greater interaction with the United States. It was especially disconcerting that the debate devolved into an unprecedented parliamentary vote of confidence on a foreign policy issue. Singh's narrowly-won victory was possible only through resort to extraordinary maneuvers, including the temporary furloughing from jail of members of parliament who had been convicted of crimes. The entire episode was hardly one to inspire confidence in New Delhi's capacity to deliver on galvanizing initiatives. That **India played** such **a prominent role in the collapse of** the **Doha** Round world trade talks, just as debate over the nuclear accord heated up only added to this perception. **More recent events** have **reinforced** **this impression**. Despite the large parliamentary support **Singh** currently enjoys, he **has yet to initiate** the **domestic** **reforms that would allow** for closer economic **engagement with the** **U**nited **S**tates. **In the face of fierce opposition** last month, **his government had to backtrack from** submitting **key legislation that would enable** the **involvement of** **US companies in India's** nuclear **energy sector** – one of the very things that the nuclear cooperation accord was suppose to bring about. Despite Singh's renewed determination to promote needed involvement in India by foreign educational institutions, similar legislation has come to naught in the past due to parliamentary concerns about protecting the country's cultural sovereignty. **His government has** also **gone slow on** two **agreements** designed **to** **strengthen military links with the** **U**nited **S**tates. Even granting the complex, cacophonous nature of Indian democracy, **New Delhi still seems to lack the political will necessary for a dramatic deepening of bilateral ties**. With the diplomatic endgame in Afghanistan coming into sight and US-Pakistan relations improving, the coming months will undoubtedly witness new broadsides in the "Obama disses India" narrative. There is good reason to criticize Washington's administration's languid engagement with India, though New Delhi's own level of enthusiasm deserves scrutiny as well. **Creating new momentum in relations will have to be a two-way street**.

**-- Alt causes --- Iran and Afghanistan**

**Karl 10** (David J., President – Asia Strategy Initiative, “[US-India Relations: Problems Posed by Afghanistan and Iran](http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/08/31/us-india-relations-problems-posed-by-afghanistan-and-iran/)”, East Asia Forum, 8-31, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/08/31/us-india-relations-problems-posed-by-afghanistan-and-iran/)

After much criticism for appearing to neglect New Delhi while courting Beijing, the **Obama** administration **is** now **moving to inject** a sense of **urgency and momentum into US-India relations**. **But just as bilateral affairs seem to have acquired** new **dynamism, differences over Afghanistan and Iran threaten to undermine positive developments**. There are several factors that explain India’s drop from Washington’s foreign policy priorities. The Obama administration took office viewing Asia’s evolutions differently to the Bush era. And Obama’s prioritising of high profile engagement with Beijing on an array of global governance issues has diverted strategic focus from New Delhi. In an address on US policy in Asia in November 2009, Obama failed to mention India even in passing. The omission was all the more glaring as Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh was due in Washington for a state visit a little over a week later. But China’s treatment of Obama during his state visit to Beijing in November 2009 and at the climate summit in Copenhagen a month later has seen the administration revert to Bush-era strategic balancing vis-à-vis China. The Bush administration’s publicly denied but widely understood goal was to build India’s strategic potential as a check against the rise of Chinese power. Is this also the goal of the Obama administration? Undersecretary of state for political affairs, William J. Burns, has affirmed in a recent address that the Obama administration is ‘deeply committed to supporting India’s rise.’ Burns has also called for India’s greater diplomatic and military involvement in East Asia and for enhanced US-Indian defence cooperation; ideas that are bound to irritate leaders in Beijing. A month later, Michele Flournoy, undersecretary of defence for policy, echoed these themes by proclaiming that ‘India’s success is very much in America’s national interest.’ This **heightened focus on India increases the likelihood that** President **Obama’s trip to India will establish new milestones in bilateral relations. But any attempt to strengthen this relationship will not be problem-free**. The **first** of these is **Afghanistan**. **Obama may need** to **shore up his** domestic **political base by accelerating the drawdown** of US military forces in Afghanistan.  **This would have obvious implications on Pakistan**, **and could** in turn **have serious consequences for** **US-India relations**. A **second** concern **is** the **tightening US sanctions against Iran**. With New Delhi feeling that the Obama administration has upset its interests in Afghanistan, India is enhancing its relations with Iran due to Indian dependence on Iranian oil resources. **The close India-Iran relationship has long troubled Washington**. For its part, the Indian government has complained that US sanctions that penalise companies helping the Iranian petroleum sector adversely affect Indian enterprises seeking to develop oil and natural gas fields in Iran. A few days after the sanctions were signed into law by President Obama, Indian Foreign Secretary Nirupama Rao explained that ties with Tehran are a ‘fundamental component’ of Indian foreign policy and noted there has been a ‘convergence of views’ on important issues. And referring to the new US sanctions, she stressed that sanctions can have direct and adverse impacts on Indian companies and India’s energy security. PJ Crowley, the US State Department spokesman, reacted to Rao’s address by stating that ‘business as usual’ with Iran by America’s friends and partners was no longer acceptable. **Afghanistan and Iran will test** the [**nascent**](http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/02/11/is-defence-cooperation-the-next-step-in-u-s-india-relations/) **US-India strategic entente** just as President Obama arrives in New Delhi. What should be an opportunity to articulate the next chapter in the bilateral partnership could well spell out its limits.

**-- No risk of collapse --- Obama will course correct to stabilize cooperation**

**Raman 10 (**B., Former Cabinet Secretary – India, “Obama Attempts to Impart Momentum to Indo-US Ties”, Rediff, 6-4, http://news.rediff.com/column/2010/jun/04/india-us-ties-back-on-fast-track.htm)

The **comments** of US leaders and officials in the run-up to the high-level strategic dialogue at the ministerial level currently under way in Washington, DC and the pre-announced decision of President Barack Obama [ [Images](http://search.rediff.com/imgsrch/default.php?MT=barack+obama) ] to attend the reception being hosted by US Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton [ [Images](http://search.rediff.com/imgsrch/default.php?MT=hillary+clinton) ], in honour of the Indian delegation on Wednesday, **indicated a realisation** by the  policy-makers of the Obama administration **of the importance attached to** the **Indo-US ties, which many believe have been downgraded** and the warmth towards India, which was characterised  the attitude of the Bush Administration towards India, has disappeared in less than a year after Obama took over as the President. The credit for drawing the attention of the Obama administration to the downslide in the comfort level between the two countries should go to analysts in India as well as the US----more particularly to the well-wishers of India in US non-governmental circles who kept sounding a wake-up call to the Obama administration that the gains of the second term of George Bush [ [Images](http://search.rediff.com/imgsrch/default.php?MT=george+bush) ] when Indo-US relations really started moving forward quantitatively and qualitatively, were being diluted by a  perceived lack of adequate attention to India. This perceived lack of adequate attention to India could be attributed to Obama's search for a workable exit policy from Afghanistan before the next presidential elections for which Pakistan's co-operation is considered necessary and for a workable economic recovery policy and a nuclear non-proliferation policy towards North Korea and Iran for which the co-operation of China was deemed necessary. The Obama administration also had to take note of Pakistani concerns over the growing Indian presence in Afghanistan and of Chinese concerns that the growing Indo-US ties under Bush were motivated by a common desire to balance China's rising stature. The first few months of the Obama administration were devoted to addressing Pakistan and China concerns without realising that this could have a negative impact on the relations with India. The open articulation by officials of the Obama administration and  some non-governmental experts of Pakistan's concerns over India's role in Afghanistan and the impression that they wittingly or unwittingly conveyed to India that they found these concerns understandable and the stepped-up military assistance to Pakistan, which was unrelated to its performance in action against terrorists operating from Pakistani territory, created an impression in India of a re-hyphenation of the US policies towards India and Pakistan, which had been discarded by the Bush Administration. Obama's unannounced jettisoning of various strategic initiatives undertaken by the Bush administration to balance China through enhancing India's power and status in the Asian region, joint naval exercises in areas of interest to China and by associating Japan [ [Images](http://search.rediff.com/imgsrch/default.php?MT=japan) ] with some of these initiatives and his action during his visit to China in November 2009 in reviving the policy of the Clinton administration of encouraging an activist role for China in South Asia--particularly in Indo-Pakistan matters--created an impression in India that a convergence of China-related perceptions, which was a defining characteristic of the policies of the Bush administration towards India was no longer a motivating factor in the White House. These two impressions--which were valid---tended to weaken the foundations of the Indo-US strategic architecture built up under Bush. **The welcome indication of  a greater focus on India in recent weeks and the beginnings of a course correction in policy-making towards India underline a realization by Obama of the intrinsic importance of  a** sound and **healthy strategic partnership between India and the US**. This does not presage a possible downgrading of the importance attached to Pakistan and China. While the Obama administration is convinced of the need to impart quality and momentum to Indo-US relations, **this exercise will be based** not **on** perceptions of common threats facing the two countries, but **common ideals such as** promotion of **democracy and** **common interests such as counter-terrorism, climate, knowledge and agriculture related initiatives**. The **Obama** administration **will take care to ensure that its course corrections give a feeling of satisfaction to India** without adding to the concerns of Pakistan and China. **Common bilateral ideals and interests will be the motivating factors**. Moderating Pakistan and balancing China will not be the motivating factors.

**-- Empirically denied --- multiple previous setbacks**

**Kurlantzick 10** (Joshua, Fellow for South-East Asia – Council on Foreign Relations, “Obama and Asia, Part Deux”, Asia Unbound – Blog of the Asia Program of the Council on Foreign Relations, 7-8, http://blogs.cfr.org/asia/categor y/india/u-s-india-relationship/)

**It’s been a rough seventeen months for the** **U**nited **S**tates **and India**. I’ve written about some of the challenges [here](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/65995/evan-a-feigenbaum/indias-rise-americas-interest) and [here](http://www.cfr.org/publication/21862/obamas_india_problem.html)—and talked about them [here](http://ibnlive.in.com/videos/113224/04_2010/ftn_1204_part/obama-cant-deliver-on-indias-concerns.html) and [here](http://ibnlive.in.com/videos/97565/07_2009/ftn2007_1/hillarys-visit-foundation-for-bigger-things-ahead.html). **First, there were** some **early missteps**, not least during the President’s 2008 campaign. As a candidate, Barack **Obama** told TIME’s Joe Klein that [he w**ould appoint a** U.S. **envoy to** seek peace in **Kashmir**](http://swampland.blogs.time.com/2008/10/23/the_full_obama_interview/). As president, he quickly backed off after strenuous Indian objections. **But Indian mistrust spiked**, then lingered, after his inauguration. **Second, the two sides** hit something of an intellectual wall. They’ve **lacked a new “big idea” to succeed the** U.S.-India civil **nuclear initiative**. We sometimes forget just how big that idea really was. It began, in a sense, as an effort to overcome a bilateral dispute left over from the 1970s. But it quickly became a full-fledged campaign to achieve a unique international status for India. **Third, the two sides suffered from a lack of momentum**. A crisis of vision (as I argued [here](http://ibnlive.in.com/videos/113224/04_2010/ftn_1204_part/obama-cant-deliver-on-indias-concerns.html)) need not automatically have led to drift in the relationship. For instance, a package of smaller ideas could have pushed things forward. But many of **the best ideas and initiatives bogged down**. These included a bilateral investment treaty, expanded civil space cooperation, export control adjustments, defense procurement deals, a more ambitious bilateral agriculture initiative, and agreements on defense logistics and communications. Intelligence and law enforcement cooperation broadened, gathering momentum from an initial boost after the November 2008 Mumbai attacks. But this really didn’t provide sufficient ballast.

**A2:** **Latin American Relations/Turns the Case**

**Our comparative claim – CIR isn’t enough**

**Schlegel 13**

[John P, a master's degree in political science (Saint Louis University), doctorate in IR (Oxford), “Looking South,” America Magazine, 1/28, <http://americamagazine.org/issue/looking-south>]

**The United States has a checkered relationship with its neighbors to the south**. **Too often the U.S. government improperly intervened in the affairs of these sovereign nations in pursuit of self-interest**. Yet the United States has also sought to play a positive role in the development of Latin America, notably through the Alliance for Progress, an economic aid program launched by President John F. Kennedy in 1961. That program had limited success, but it serves as an important reminder of the positive relationship that the United States should try to cultivate with Latin America. Much has changed in 50 years, of course. The United States is no longer the only economic superpower in the Western hemisphere. Brazil, in particular, has emerged as a key trading partner with China and is seeking a permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council. **The relationship with Latin America needs to be rethought in light of the emergence of several important regional players**.¶ President **Obama is poised to tackle immigration reform**, an issue that will have important ramifications for U.S. relations with Mexico and other Latin American countries. Failure on the part of the United States to address the plight of undocumented immigrants has led to frustration and uncertainty in Latin America. **Yet immigration reform is just one piece of the policy puzzle. Other initiatives are needed as well, and not just additional U.S. funding for the government drug wars** in Mexico, Central America and Colombia, for example. **If the United States wants to exert a positive influence in the Western hemisphere, then courage and creativity will be required.** These countries deserve special attention from President Obama in his second term.

**Immigration is only a stepping stone – massive alt causes**

**Sullivan 13**

[Mark P, Coordinator for the CRS and Specialist in Latin American Affairs, “Latin America and the Caribbean: Key Issues for the 113th Congress,” Congressional Research Service, 2/8, <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42956.pdf>]

Many **policy analysts** and think tanks across the political spectrum **have called for the ¶ Administration to elevate U.S. relations** with both Brazil and Mexico, the two economic ¶ powerhouses of the region. Many advocate a deepening and broadening of U.S. relations with ¶ Brazil in the areas of defense and security, trade, energy, and also multilateral issues given ¶ Brazil’s rising global profile. With regard to Mexico, **many argue that the Obama Administration ¶ should, in addition to continuing strong security cooperation, seize the opportunity to work with a ¶ new government in Mexico in deepening economic relations, including energy cooperation, and ¶ engaging Mexico on global issues.**31 On immigration, in particular, many Latin America policy ¶ analysts have called for U.S. efforts to fix its immigration system as a means of improving ¶ relations not only with Mexico, but with the region overall. Michael Shifter of the Inter-American ¶ Dialogue maintains that meaningful immigration reform would be welcomed throughout Latin ¶ America, especially in Mexico, “where the issue has long been a source of tension in the bilateral ¶ relationship.”32¶ Think tanks and **policy analysts have made numerous other recommendations for U.S. policy ¶ toward the region**.33 **With regard to drug policy, there are calls for the United States to re-evaluate its anti-drug strategy**, pointing to efforts by some Latin American leaders and others to explore ¶ drug policy alternatives. While **some stress the need to sustain a strong international drug control ¶ regime** focused on eradication and interdiction, others appear to emphasize the need for more ¶ efforts to address U.S. domestic drug addiction and consumption. **With regard to Cuba, some ¶ argue for moving away from the sanctions-based approach toward Cuba, while others contend ¶ that sanctions should be maintained as long as the government continues its harsh human rights ¶ violations. With regard to democracy promotion, some analysts argue that U.S. engagement with ¶ the region should include a more vibrant democracy promotion component, especially in ¶ countries facing challenges; others contend that the United States already has strong democracy ¶ and human rights programs; and some question the efficacy of such programs.**

**Won’t solve – current negotiations send conflicting signals**

-Republican signal

-Future questions

**Berg 13**

[Kirsten, research associate with the Bernard L. Schwartz Fellows Program at the New America Foundation, “Immigration Frustration,” New America Foundation, 3/22, <http://inthetank.newamerica.net/blog/2013/03/immigration-frustration>]

Tamar **Jacoby is not as optimistic about immigration reform as you might think**.¶ Even as momentum seems to be swinging strongly towards a breakthrough — bipartisan groups of legislators hammering away at deals, with Republican in a frenzy to appeal to a growing Latino electorate—the **reform advocate warns that the partisan divide is larger than it looks**.¶ What’s more, she explained during a pizza policy lunch with staff at New America, is that the **negotiations are focusing too much on the 11 million already in this country and not enough on the more significant issue: the immigrants to come.**¶ Jacoby, a 2013 Schwartz Fellow, has been advising lawmakers through the latest round of negotiations as the CEO of ImmigrationWorks USA, a national coalition of business owners pushing for comprehensive immigration reform.¶ **The centerpiece of the current immigration-related negotiations appears to be the question of how to deal with immigrants that are already here.** With both parties promoting visions for a route to legalization for those living illegally in the U.S., it may seem as if Congress will finally be able to reach an agreement on something. But if you listen closely, Jacoby says, **their paths diverge in significant ways**. ¶ Roughly along party lines (with notable exceptions) **Democrats have been advocating for a “path to citizenship” while Republicans have been pushing for a “path to legal status**.” The difference isn’t as pronounced as the last time the last time Congress took on comprehensive immigration reform in 2007, when the debate came down to whether they should be given legal status at all.¶ (New America’s Andrés Martinez and Jacoby had a great discussion about what has changed—and what has not changed—since the last time immigration reform seemed inevitable in 2007. You can watch that here)¶ But **it isn’t trivial. It’s the difference between whether millions will get a chance to become full citizens of the United States, or whether millions will be given a chance for legal residency only**. ¶ The Gang of Eight in the Senate look to be leaning toward a path to citizenship, and even Tea Party-favorite Rand Paul recently seemed to endorse the idea that undocumented immigrants should be granted work visas that would allow them to apply for green cards and, eventually, citizenship. ¶ Then again, Jacoby says, **it’s not hard to imagine a scenario where Republicans, especially in the House trot out the familiar cries of “amnesty” and block any action involving a path to citizenship**. And, she says, it’s not hard to imagine Democrats, unwilling to accept anything less than full citizenship, walk away and tell Latino voters that they tried, but the GOP blocked them.¶ **The question, she says, comes down to whether politicians want to make a "deal," or whether they want to make an "issue.**" **And given the current track record, a deal on immigration might be less inevitable than it seems.**¶ **Beyond the controversial issues that threaten to derail a deal**—border security and the debate over legal status—**Jacoby says the more important piece to comprehensive immigration reform is setting up a system to deal with immigrants of the future**.¶ The fact is, she says, that most immigrants would like to come here legally and most employers would like to higher workers legally, and that a lot of them can’t find Americans to take the less-skilled positions they need to fill. What she proposes, and has written in detail about here, is a smarter worker visa program. The program she envisions would allow businesses provided they prove that they could not find an American citizen to fill the position and offer a fair wage, to hire a certain number of foreign workers every year. The caps on the number of worker visas issued would fluctuate with demand, rather than be set at a static, arbitrary number.¶ Jacoby presents the idea as better: for workers, who gain rights and better wages; for businesses, who get the labor they need to contribute to economic growth: and for the government, which would get some much-needed relief at the border.¶ But like other components of reform, this, too, gets controversial when discussing details. Similar to **attempts** to push this kind of program in years past **have been blocked by what she characterizes as “an unholy alliance of labor-friendly Democrats and anti-immigrant Republicans” that don’t like the idea of more worker visas—and these groups are still around to act as spoilers.¶ For now, she says, there essentially remain two signs at the border: KEEP OUT and HELP WANTED. Whether that de facto policy changes is still up to those negotiating deals in Congress.¶ There is momentum. But is there momentum to get it right?**

**A2: Legalization – Ag**

**Immigration doesn’t solve agricultural labor crisis—foreign** **workers don’t want to come to the US**

**Plumer, 1/29**

(Brad – reporter, 2013, “We’re running out of farm workers. Immigration reform won’t help.”, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/01/29/the-u-s-is-running-out-of-farm-workers-immigration-reform-may-not-help/)

For years, one of the groups pushing hardest for immigration reform has been the U.S. food industry. **Farmers** have long **grumbled about** a **shortage of labor, and they’ve asked for policies that make it easier to hire foreign workers** from places like Mexico.

**But looser immigration laws may not** be able to **keep** our **food cheap** forever. A recent study suggests that **U.S. farms could** well **face a shortage of low-cost labor** in the years ahead **no matter what Congress does on immigration**. That’s because **Mexico is getting richer and can no longer supply as many rural farm workers** to the United States. And **it won’t be nearly as easy to import low-wage ag**ricultural **workers** from elsewhere.

For decades, farms in the United States have relied heavily on low-wage foreign workers — mainly from Mexico — to work their fields. In 2006, 77 percent of all agricultural workers in the United States were foreign-born. (And half of those foreign workers were undocumented immigrants.) All that cheap labor has helped keep down U.S. food prices, particularly for labor-intensive fruits and vegetables.

But that labor pool is now drying up. In recent years, we’ve seen a spate of headlines like this from CNBC: “California Farm Labor Shortage ‘Worst It’s Been, Ever’.” Typically, these stories blame drug-related violence on the Mexican border or tougher border enforcement for the decline. Hence the call for new guest-worker programs.

But a new paper from U.C. Davis offers up a simpler explanation for the labor shortage. Mexico is getting richer. And, **when a country gets richer, its pool of rural agricultural labor shrinks**. Not only are **Mexican workers shift**ing **into other sectors like construction**, but **Mexico’s own farms are increasing wages**. That means **U.S. farms will have to pay higher** and higher **wages to attract a dwindling pool** of available Mexican farm workers.

“It’s a simple story,” says Edward **Taylor, an agricultural economist at U.C. Davis** and one of the study’s authors. ”By the mid-twentieth century, Americans stopped doing farm work. And we were only able to avoid a farm-labor crisis by bringing in workers from a nearby country that was at an earlier stage of development. Now that era is coming to an end.”

Taylor and his co-authors argue that the United States could face a sharp adjustment period as a result. Americans appear unwilling to do the sort of low-wage farm work that we have long relied on immigrants to do. And, the paper **notes, it may be difficult to find an abundance of cheap farm labor anywhere** else — potential targets such as **Guatemala and El Salvador are** either **too small or are urbanizing too rapidly.**

So the **labor shortages will keep getting worse**. And that leaves several choices. American farmers could simply stop growing crops that need a lot of workers to harvest, such as fruits and vegetables. Given the demand for fresh produce, that seems unlikely.

Alternatively, U.S. farms could continue to invest in new labor-saving technologies, such as “shake-and-catch” machines to harvest fruits and nuts. “Under this option,” the authors write, “capital improvements in farm production would increase the marginal product of farm labor; U.S. farms would hire fewer workers and pay higher wages.” That could be a boon to domestic workers — studies have found that 23 percent of U.S. farm worker families are below the poverty line.

In the meantime, however, farm groups are hoping they can fend off that day of reckoning by revamping the nation’s immigration laws. The bipartisan **immigration-reform** proposal unveiled in the Senate on Monday contained several provisions aimed at boosting the supply of farm workers, including the promise of an easier path to citizenship.

Taylor, however, **is not** convinced that this is **a viable long-term strategy**. “**The idea** that **you can design a guest-worker program or** any other **immigration** policy **to solve this farm labor problem isn’t realistic**,” he says. “**It assumes** that **there’s a willingness to keep doing farm work on the other side of the border**. And **that’s already dropping off**.”

**CIR cant solve ag**

**Wall 13** – personal finance reporter for the Daily and Sunday Telegraph and Telegraph.co.uk, citing Baring Asset Management (Emma, 03/02, “As the price of food rises, is there profit to be made?” http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/personalfinance/investing/9902374/As-the-price-of-food-rises-is-there-profit-to-be-made.html)

Noticed the price of sugar lately? Potatoes? Fresh fruit? A weak pound, US drought and one of the wettest years on record for Britain have all contributed to the cost of your shopping basket soaring. When sterling falls, your money buys fewer of the commodities that need to be imported. In fact, the recent sharp falls probably haven't had their full impact in yet. But the story of rising food prices is about much more than currency swings. And it provides tempting possibilities for investors. **Extreme weather in 2012 led to sharp price rises** in the likes of corn, wheat and soya beans, **and these prices look likely to remain elevated for the next six months**, according to Baring Asset Management. **There is also a long-term crunch between supply and demand.** In fact, food production must increase by at least 70pc by 2050 to meet global demand. According to the United Nations, **the world's population is forecast to increase** from 7 billion **to 9.3 billion over the next 40 years**, and to meet this demand investment in food production is needed. The Ecclesiastical Investment Management Amity Insight report Hungry Planet warned that **our current food supply is just not sustainable** in the medium to long term, and can only be solved through extensive investment in global agriculture, which will help increase crop yields. Neville White, socially responsible investment analyst at Ecclesiastical, said: "Increased food production will have to be achieved with less land, water and people. Investing in companies with a focus on mechanisation, crop production and fertilisation that aim to increase food production can not only have a real impact on food but can also ensure that investors profit with principles." There are two ways to invest in food: you can buy commodities through trading on the future price of a grain or crop and/or buying an exchange-traded fund. Or you can buy shares in agriculture and food-production related companies. Sarasin AgriSar invests in the entire supply chain, from grain to supermarkets. This means that although you may miss out on large upsurges in the soft commodities market, growth should be smoother. Henry Boucher, manager of the AgriSar fund, said that holding food-related shares was a more ethical way of investing – handing your money to companies in the chain reduces their capital cost and helps them invest to improve food supply. "Some speculators invest in food itself, which takes supply out of the market [if they store it for later sale at higher prices]," said Mr Boucher. "Commodity traders invest directly in corn, pork bellies, wheat and sugar. We're more interested in finding companies that help improve global productivity." He cites investments like Japan's Kubota, which makes small rice transplanters, or Indian company Syngenta, whose fertiliser and seed pre-mix is designed to improve productivity by up to four times. "Both make products for the small farmer – they can be used on land as little as one acre," he said. "This is not about mass-farming but helping the small businesses left in the Asian countryside." **Speculative "futures" investing in food markets can also be** more **volatile.** Futures are short-term punts – **one bad crop season, due to disease or** extreme **weather, may mean significant losses.** Agriculture-related shares are held for longer and are less affected by natural disasters. Jonathan Blake, manager of the Baring Global Agriculture fund, said last year's weather had enhanced the investment appeal of those companies providing the likes of seeds, herbicides and fertilisers, which will enable farmers to maximise their crop output. "It will take time to address the shortfalls caused by the severe weather events of 2012, from droughts in America to washout conditions in the UK and Europe," said Mr Blake. "We do, however, expect crop prices to come down later in 2013, providing we have a year of 'normal' weather, as significantly improved output will allow inventory levels to begin to be rebuilt." The Baring fund has a sizeable proportion of listed fertiliser, herbicide and seed producers. "Crop production, through the continuous cycle of planting, growing and harvesting, robs the soil of nutrients," said Mr Blake. "As a result, these nutrients need replenishing through the application of fertilisers. Additionally, for many farmers these nutrients are highly affordable given the current high prices farmers are able to get for their crops." Schroders Climate Change manager Simon Webber also likes investing in companies that offer productivity solutions which will help bring down the price of food through use of their products to increase farming production. He also invests in Syngenta and US company Trimble Navigation, which provides solutions for levelling fields. It is not just population growth that provides investment opportunities in the food sector, but the change in global diets. As disposable incomes swell in emerging markets, diets tend to become more Westernised. The AgriSar fund invests in Asian supermarket chain Dairy Farm, whose revenues have risen as the expanding middle classes change their dietary and shopping habits. "Incomes in China are increasing at 10pc a year," said Mr Boucher. "People are no longer going to the market daily but visit a supermarket once a week, where they will be buying more meat, dairy products and imported vegetables." Mr Webber said that on top of the global demand for more agricultural produce are the effects on supply, where **available** productive **land is in decline**, yield growth is reducing **and there is a growing competition from the biofuel industry for feedstock. "Climate change acts as a threat multiplier to the sector on top of** the dual impacts of **increased demand and decreased supply**, presenting various investment opportunities. The sectors that will benefit from this are companies involved in agricultural production as well as food retailers, whose share price will increase as food prices inflate."

**Population outweighs**

**Johnson 13** – writer for the Council on Foreign Relations

(Toni, 01/16, “Food Price Volatility and Insecurity,” http://www.cfr.org/food-security/food-price-volatility-insecurity/p16662)

The Global Food Market Just fifteen food crops make up 90 percent of the world's energy intake, according to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), with rice, maize (corn), and wheat comprising two-thirds of that number. The world grows more grains (PDF)--also known as cereals--than any other crop type. Much of the global increase in food prices stems from staple grains, which in some countries can represent more than half of calorie intake. According to the World Bank, due to an incredibly dry summer in the United States and Europe, global corn and soybean prices reached all-time highs in July 2012, while wheat soared to prices comparable to 2011 peaks. Because grains also represent a major food source for livestock, higher grain prices have contributed to higher dairy and meat prices. **The USDA predicts** that domestically, **prices will continue to rise in 2013** at a rate of 3 to 4 percent. A June 2011 report to G20 agriculture ministers from ten major NGOs, including the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and the UN World Food Program, noted that **by 2050, food demand** (PDF) **will have increased by between 70** percent **and 100 percent to meet** a projected **population growth** of at least 2.5 billion additional people. "**This alone is sufficient to exert pressure on commodity prices**," the report said. Growth in agriculture production is largely expected to come from increased crop yields and will primarily be located in developing countries, according to a 2009 UN report (PDF). Experts say there is plenty of opportunity to improve farming techniques in the developing world. Meeting projected demand will require increasing cereal production by an additional one billion tons, up from more than two billion tons currently, and more than doubling meat production from current levels. However, according to a 2011 report by the OECD, annual **growth in ag**riculture production (PDF) **in the next decade is forecast to be a third less than** the annual growth **in the previous decade.** The report estimates that a 5 percent increase or decrease in harvest yield in major grains can lead to as much as a 25 percent difference in price. Food Price Volatility According to the FAO, price volatility has been extremely rare in agricultural markets, but **the global food system is becoming increasingly vulnerable** to it. The 2011 NGO report argued that "volatility becomes an issue for concern and for possible policy response when it induces risk-adverse behavior that leads to inefficient investment decisions and when it creates problems that are beyond the capacity of producers, consumers, or nations to cope."

**A2: Legalization – General**

**No impact for at least 13 years- phased in**

**WP, 2-19**-2013 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/02/19/undocumented-immigrants-would-have-13-year-wait-for-citizenship-under-obama-plan/>

A draft of the White House immigration bill was leaked over the weekend, detailing a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants that would take about **13 years** after the passage of the bill to complete, policy experts say.¶ The Miami Herald has posted the full text of the draft, which explains how undocumented immigrants would have to go to the “back of the line” to ensure they don’t get citizenship before prospective immigrants who went through legal channels. (You also can read the sections detailing employer enforcement and border security.)¶ The process is broken down into three stages: First, undocumented immigrants must apply for “**L**awful **P**rospective **I**mmigrant **S**tatus,” which would allow them to work and travel outside the United States with some restrictions, but which would bar them from receiving any government benefits. Prospective immigrants would have to pay back taxes and prove they’re pursuing a Education Department-approved course of study to learn English and an “understanding of the history and Government of the United States,” according to the draft. They’d also have to apply to renew their provisional legal status every four years.¶ Second, those prospective immigrants must either wait eight years from when the comprehensive bill is passed or until the backlog of legal immigrants waiting for visas is cleared before being able to get a green card,”whichever comes earlier,” explains Muzaffar Chishti, director of the Migration Policy Institute’s office at NYU School of Law. Once they get a green card — which grants “legal permanent residence” — immigrants typically have to wait at least five more years to become naturalized citizens.¶ So, in total, qualified undocumented immigrants would likely have to wait at least 13 years to get full citizenship. Some pro-immigration advocates aren’t happy about that wait. “It takes longer than we think is necessary,” says Lynn Tramonte, deputy director of America’s Voice. The PICO National Network, a coalition of faith-based community organizers, says the proposal could “delay citizenship another generation” and believes that the wait will be even longer than it looks on paper.¶ “In practice this could mean people waiting another 15 to 20 years to be fully integrated into society as citizens,” Gordon Whitman, PICO’s policy director, said in a statement.

**Can’t solve- reform overwhelms the** USCIS **and causes a massive backlog**

**RSN 10** (Right Side News, “U.S. Legislative Immigration Update April 5, 2010”, 4-5, http://www.rightsidenews .com/201004059409/us/homeland-security/us-legislative-immigration-update-april-5-2010.html)

*DHS Official: Amnesty Would Cause "the Mother of All Backlogs"¶* Testifying before the House Judiciary Immigration Subcommittee on March 23rd, the DHS Assistant Inspector General told lawmakers that **granting amnesty would create "the mother of all backlogs" in the** Bureau of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (**USCIS**). USCIS, the federal agency tasked with adjudicating applications and petitions for visas, employment authorization, green cards, etc., has incurred a formidable backlog since its inception in 2003. ([Statement of Frank W. Deffer](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/pdf/Deffer100323.pdf), March 23, 2010). **The** March 23 **hearing was meant to shed light on the steps USCIS is taking to address this backlog, as well as a** possible **increase in** petition and application **fees**.¶ Assistant Inspector General Deffer's testimony described how the existing backlog at USCIS was closely connected to the agency's poor information technology and the program already underway to modernize it. ([Statement](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/pdf/Deffer100323.pdf), March 23, 2010). The modernization began in 2005, when **USCIS embarked on a**n enterprise-wide **transformation program** **to transition its fragmented, paper-based system to a** centralized and **consolidated** electronic **system**. At that time, the DHS Inspector General reported that **USCIS' processes were primarily manual, paper-based and duplicative**, resulting in "ineffective use of human and financial resources" and described USCIS' information technology for processing immigration benefits as "inefficient, hindering its ability to carry out its mission." (Id.).¶ At the hearing, Deffer noted that USCIS's modernization efforts are particularly important, because of "a significant backlog of cases." Each year, Deffer stated, USCIS receives more than 7.5 million immigration applications and petitions. To adjudicate and process these applications, USCIS has more than 15,000 employees and contractor personnel in more than 250 offices worldwide. Deffer noted, however, that despite progress made to improve information technology management, "significant challenges remain." ([Statement](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/pdf/Deffer100323.pdf), March 23, 2010).¶ Subcommittee Chairwoman Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) clearly agreed. "The agency still continues to use a filing system that is predominantly paper-based," she said. "[W]ith approximately 55 million files spread out over numerous offices across the country...it's hard to believe that any federal agency dealing with millions of files has not yet developed a primarily digital filing system." Lofgren noted that despite USCIS's transformation" program to modernize its IT system, a July 2009 report from the DHS Inspector General found "that the transformation efforts were ineffective and plagued with problems." ([Hearing Information](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/hear_100323_1.html), March 23, 2010; See also [DHS Inspector General Repor](http://www.dhs.gov/xoig/assets/mgmtrpts/OIG_09-90_Jul09.pdf)t, July 2009).¶ Rep. Sheila **Jackson-Lee** (D-TX), a notorious proponent of amnesty for illegal aliens, **pressed USCIS Director** Alejandro Mayorkas and Assistant Inspector General Deffer **on whether USCIS was prepared to handle the processing of millions of amnesty applications should Congress pass** a so-called "comprehensive **immigration reform**" bill. "**I cannot imagine**," Jackson-Lee declared, "**if we pass** comprehensive **immigration reform, what a paper-based system will do**." While Mayorkas attempted to argue that USCIS would be able to successfully implement an amnesty program, Deffer offered a much less optimistic assessment: "**In effect, adding twelve million more people to the system would be the mother of all backlogs.**" Deffer continued: "**Clearly, to us, the systems could not handle it now**." ([Hearing Information](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/hear_100323_1.html), March 23, 2010).

**Amnesty causes a tsunami of applications**

**Sherk 8** (James, Fellow in Labor Policy – Heritage Foundation, “Next Steps for Immigration and Border Security Reform: Restructuring the Work Visa”, Heritage Backgrounder, 9-30, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/ 2008/09/Next-Steps-for-Immigration-and-Border-Security-Reform-Restructuring-the-Work-Visa)

Last year, lawmakers on Capitol Hill tried and failed to pass comprehensive immigration and border security reform. The bill died largely because it tried to do too much. **Granting amnesty to** 12 million **ille­gal aliens would cause rampant fraud and a tsunami of applications that would overwhelm America's already over-stretched and backlogged immigration services**. Creating a temporary worker program for the illegal aliens is an equally unworkable idea. On the other hand, lawful immigrants and foreign tem­porary workers (who enter the country legally with a non-immigrant status through a worker visa) are inte­gral components of the American workforce. The appropriate approach for Congress and the Adminis­tration, as part of a responsible overall program to restructure American immigration and border secu­rity policies, is to begin by reforming existing visa policies in a manner that appropriately addresses concerns regarding security, sovereignty, citizenship, and economic growth.

**A2: Legalization – US/Mexico**

**Decades to solve – institutions are a prereq**

June S. **Beittel** 8/3/**12** (Analyst in Latin American Affairs, congressional research service, “Mexico’s Drug Trafficking Organizations: Source and Scope of the Rising Violence” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41576.pdf)

**To reduce the violence will require public support for the government’s policy**. Thus far, the ¶ confrontation with the DTOs and other criminal organizations has failed to bring the violence ¶ down, and **public backing for** **the Calderón counterdrug strategy has waned**. Some observers have ¶ criticized the Calderón government for adopting an aggressive approach (literally declaring war ¶ on the drug traffickers) without having a clear definition of success, without understanding the ¶ consequences of the policy, and without having the tools necessary to win.¶ 204¶ **Elements of the ¶ government’s strategy** in the Beyond Mérida program that are designed to reduce the violence, ¶ **such as institutionalizing the rule of law, reforming the justice system, and completing economic ¶ and social development programs to combat crime, all have a longer timeframe**.¶ 205¶ **It may take** ¶ years or **decades to build effective**, efficient legal **institutions in Mexico that resist threats and ¶ bribery**. Yet **policy analysts believe these institutions are necessary before the DTOs can be ¶ reduced from a national security threat to a law and order problem**.

**No spillover – if it does the impact is tiny**

Phil **Williams and** Vanda **Felbab-Brown** April 20**12** (PHIL WILLIAMS is the Wesley W. Posvar Professor ¶ and Director of the Matthew B. Ridgway Center for ¶ International Security Studies at the University of ¶ Pittsburgh. His previous assignments included Visiting Professor at the Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. ¶ Army War College; and Visiting Scientist at CERT ¶ Carnegie Mellon University, where he worked on cyber-crime and infrastructure protection. Dr. Williams ¶ has worked extensively on transnational criminal networks, terrorist networks, terrorist finances, and has ¶ focused most recently on the rise of drug trafficking ¶ violence in Mexico, VANDA FELBAB-BROWN is a Fellow in the Latin ¶ America Initiative and in the 21st Century Defense ¶ Initiative in Foreign Policy at the Brookings Institution.upitt strategic studies institute, “DRUG TRAFFICKING, VIOLENCE, AND INSTABILITY” http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub1101.pdf)

**Drug trafficking organizations in Mexico** pose ¶ perhaps the second greatest threat to U.S. security on ¶ the part of today’s actors involved in the global drug ¶ trade. Unlike jihadi terrorist groups in Afghanistan ¶ and Pakistan, they **do not seek to target the U.S. homeland or intend to conduct a** deadly **terrorism campaign ¶ against the U**nited **S**tates. **Nor do they have the capac-ity or desire to overthrow the Mexican government**. ¶ **Mexico is not a failing state.** But **any spillover** of the ¶ drug war from Mexico **could threaten public safety in ¶ certain U.S. localities, including substantial increases ¶ in murder rates, kidnapping, and** other **violent crime**.

**Squo solves cartels and mexico stability**

Robert C. **Bonner**, August 20**10** (Senior Principal of the Sentinel HS Group. He was Administrator of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration from 1990 to 1993 and Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection from 2001 to 2005, Foreign Affairs, vol 89. No 4. “The New Cocaine Cowboys Subtitle: How to Defeat Mexico's Drug Cartels” l/n)

**Calderón's initiatives have begun to destabilize the cartels,** and many **cartel leaders are now on the run**. In December 2009, **the Mexican navy** -- the country's least corrupt government institution -- acting on intelligence, **surrounded** one of the cartels' kingpins, Arturo Beltrán **Leyva**, **and killed** **him** and a number of his bodyguards in a shootout in Cuernavaca, south of Mexico City. More recently, units of the newly constituted **Mexican Federal Police captured** Teodoro García **Simental**, the kingpin who had taken over the Tijuana cartel **after** the Mexican government captured **the** Arellano **Félix brothers**, the cartel's former leaders, **and crippled their criminal network**. **Calderón has** also **taken action to tighten security at** Mexican **ports** and along the country's southern border in order **to disrupt the inflow of cocaine, weapons, and drug precursor chemicals**. Although much remains to be done, Mexican authorities have seized over 80 metric tons of cocaine since Calderón took office. The recent seizures of four tons of pseudoephedrine, a precursor chemical used to make methamphetamine, and nearly a ton of cocaine at the ports of Veracruz and Manzanillo are evidence of Mexico's enhanced interdiction efforts.¶ **Even so, the number of drug-related homicides has risen** in the last few years. An estimated 22,000 drug-related murders have occurred since Calderón took office, with nearly 9,000 in 2009 alone. **This has led some to conclude that violence in Mexico is out of control. Others have suggested that the country is on the verge of becoming a "failed state"** (or, in the words of a 2008 U.S. military report, at risk of "rapid and sudden collapse**"). The former is a gross exaggeration, and the latter is simply untrue**.¶ **Ninety percent of the homicides have involved members of one drug cartel killing members of another.** Most of the rest have been heavily armed cartel members murdering Mexican soldiers or police. Some innocent bystanders have been killed, but they represent a small fraction of the total. Violence in Mexico today is nothing like the carnage that plagued Colombia in the late 1980s and 1990s. Last year, Chihuahua, the state in which Juárez is located, had a homicide rate of 143 per 100,000 -- one of the worst in the Western Hemisphere, to be sure, yet less than one-third the rate in Medellín during the last years of Pablo Escobar and the Medellín cartel in the early 1990s. Indeed, Mexico's national homicide rate last year was ten for every 100,000 people, far lower than Brazil's (25) and Venezuela's (48). **Mexico may be violent, but it is not out of control.¶ Nor is Mexico a failed state**. **Most of the drug-related homicides have occurred in just six of Mexico's 32 states, and the majority of them** have been **in** the state of **Chihuahua**. **The increase in the number of drug-related homicides,** although unfortunate, **is a sign of progress: a consequence**, in part, **of government actions that are destabilizing the drug cartels and denying them access to areas in which they used to operate with complete impunity.** As a result, the **cartels are starting to fight one another**. The carnage in Juárez, for example, is largely the result of fighting between the local Juárez cartel and the Sinaloa cartel for control of the Juárez-Chihuahua corridor, one of the primary smuggling routes into the United States. (There was a similar, but worse, increase in violence in Colombia during the death throes of the cartels there.) **Once these cartels are broken, public safety and security will follow,** as was the case in Colombia. One need only look at Medellín today.

**Extension – SQ Solves**

**Overall murder rate lower, new trends, new Mexican strategy – best metrics**

LARRY **KAPLOW** **1/16**/13 (freelance journalist in Mexico City and was previously a Baghdad bureau chief for Newsweek, foreign policy, “Mexico's False Dawn”http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/01/16/mexico\_s\_false\_dawn)

Much of **Mexico** remains very violent, but the **killings have ebbed** somewhat **from the worst days of the drug war**. In recent years, its homicide rate has stood at more than three and a half times that of the United States. But **there has been incremental improvement**: In a (probably incomplete) tally, the daily **Reforma counted about 9,800 gang-related murders in 2012 -- down from 12,366 in 2011**. Alejandro **Hope**, director of security policy at the Mexican Competitiveness Institute, **says all murder** -- perhaps **a better indicator than just cartel-related counts** -- **was down** about 8 percent in 2012.¶ So though there were still four times as many gang murders as in 2007, last year's drop has brought a sense of relief. In Juarez, **businesses are reopening** and night life is returning. **Vacationers flocked back** to Acapulco after a massive military effort there. It reminds me of the more extreme situation I saw covering the Iraq war, as people became almost giddy in 2007 when bombings dropped from several times a week to just a few times a month. There, people used to say that a dying man is happy to find out he's only sick. U.S. commanders called it a "tolerable" level of violence.¶ But **preventing another deadly spiral of violence depends on how much the change is due to strengthened Mexican institutions.** In a recent conversation, **Hope listed encouraging signs**: **The government** doubled and **tripled security budgets over recent years**, and **the police and military improved their tactics.** The **security forces have been going after midlevel narcos, which cut cartel capabilities but don't create the violent power vacuums that occur when kingpins are toppled**. Others note that the **feds have smartly disbanded entire local police forces, which are** often too **corrupt or intimidated** to do any good, **before starting anti-crime sweeps**.

**Extension – No Impact**

**Violence doesn’t prevent growth – econ up**

June S. **Beittel** 8/3/**12** (Analyst in Latin American Affairs, congressional research service, “Mexico’s Drug Trafficking Organizations: Source and Scope of the Rising Violence” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41576.pdf)

According to some estimates, **the violence costs the country** roughly **one percentage point of ¶ annual economic growth.¶** 136¶ However, **Mexico’s economy grew an estimated 4% in 2011 and** the ¶ government has argued that **overall growth and foreign investment have not been harmed**. In ¶ April 2012, **the government vigorously denied the claim** of an important national employers’ ¶ federation (Coparmex) **that violence and threats** of violence **caused 160,000 businesses to leave ¶ Mexico** in 2011.¶ 137¶ Similarly, with regard to tourism the record is mixed. While the U.S. ¶ government has issued increasingly foreboding travel warnings and tourism has declined in the ¶ border region, **more than 22 million tourists visited Mexico in 2011, breaking records set in ¶ 2008**.¶ 138¶ Some of this increase can be attributed to policies adopted by the Calderón government ¶ to make tourism more attractive to foreign visitors.

**Extension – No Spillover**

**Mexico instability doesn’t cause US instability – data – this card is the bomb**

Kristin M. **Finklea et al** 8/25/**11** (Kristin M. Finklea, Coordinator ¶ Analyst in Domestic Security ¶ William J. Krouse ¶ Specialist in Domestic Security and Crime Policy ¶ Marc R. Rosenblum ¶ Specialist in Immigration Policy, congressional research service, “Southwest Border Violence: Issues in Identifying and Measuring Spillover Violence” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/R41075.pdf)

Mexico, **one may expect to see an increase in violence since December 2006, when** Mexican ¶ President Felipe **Calderon** took office and **began to crack down on the DTOs**.¶ 89¶ **For each of these ¶ 230 cities, CRS determined whether there was a corresponding MSA and violent crime rate** ¶ reported in the UCR **for that MSA.** CRS identified 138 such MSAs, 8 of which directly abut the ¶ border between the United States and Mexico.¶ 90¶ As illustrated in Figure 3, **CRS calculated the ¶ average violent crime rate across the border MSAs and the non-border MSAs for** each of fiscal ¶ years **1999 through 2009.** CRS **analysis of available data suggests that the violent crime rate has not significantly increased ¶ in those areas where there is an identified presence of Mexican DTOs, as well as available data on ¶ the violent crime rate for those MSAs.** Further, such analysis suggests **there is no statistically significant difference in the average violent crime rate in these border and non-border MSAs ¶ between** fiscal years **1999 and 2009**. **Since 2001, the average violent crime rate in** the eight ¶ selected **border MSAs has** generally **declined, and it has remained below the national violent ¶ crime rate** since 2005.¶ 91¶ It is unknown, however, whether trends in the violent crime rate are ¶ related to changes in drug trafficking-related violent crimes. Because the violent crime rate is a ¶ compilation of violent crimes both related and unrelated to drug trafficking, an increase in drug ¶ trafficking-related violent crime could be masked by a decrease in those violent crimes not related ¶ to trafficking—or vice versa.

**A2: Semi Conductors**

**U.S. dominating now**

**Savala 13**

[Karen, president, SEMI Americas, “U.S. Semiconductor Market Poised for Long-Term Growth,” 6/4, Semi, <http://www.semi.org/en/node/45881>]

**Six years ago, the outlook for U.S. semiconductor manufacturing was dim and dimmer**. At the time, Intel was building their Dalian fab, AMD was ramping up their Dresden facilities, TI was transitioning to a fab-lite model, and the U.S.-based fabless giants were growing their business through foundries based in Asia. **It was common for people to see semiconductors like other manufactured goods, inevitably moving to Asia**, just another example of merciless globalization. ¶ **Today, the outlook for U.S. semiconductor manufacturing couldn’t be more promising**.¶ **The U**nited **States has rebounded to become once again one of the largest and fastest growing regions of the world for semiconductor manufacturing**. In 2007, the percentage of equipment spending for chip manufacturing in the US had dropped to 15 percent, an all-time low. Today, **the U.S. market represents over 20 percent of world equipment spending with promising expectations for continued growth**. U.S. **fabs and their supply chains are now seen as leading a high-tech manufacturing renaissance**, and no less than the President of the United States has taken notice. Earlier this month, President Barack Obama visited Applied Materials in Austin, saying, “We’ve got to do everything we can to help the kind of high-tech manufacturing that you’re doing right here at Applied.”¶ **Leading this rebound are chip giants Intel and GLOBALFOUNDRIES**, but **robust equipment and material spending will also occur at Micron, TI, Samsung, and Maxim**. This year, Intel will spend up to $3.5 billion, primarily at their Fab 42 in Arizona and Dx1 Fab in Oregon; and GLOBALFOUNDRIES will invest $1.2-$1.8 billion on equipment at their new fab in New York. Samsung will spend $1.8-$2.5 billion to increase capacity at their Austin facility by 60 percent. In addition, Micron, CNSE (NanofabX for G450C), IBM, and Maxim may collectively spend up to $1.5 billion in equipment this year. **Over $8 billion will be spent in equipment in the U.S. in 2013, nearly as much as South Korea and well over double the spending in China, Europe or Japan. Spending will further increase in 2014.**¶ **In materials, we project that spending will increase 3 percent in North America to $4.85 billion**. This number is overwhelmingly dominated by front-end materials, as back-end operations are mostly located in Asia. In photomask materials, for example, **the U.S. represents approximately 20 percent of the world’s demand**.¶ **The renaissance in semiconductor manufacturing is good for the industry, SEMI members and the U.S. economy.** According to the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics data, **the semiconductor industry has added jobs three times faster than the rest of the U.S. economy** in 2011. The semiconductor industry’s manufacturing workforce grew by 3.7 percent over the previous year, while jobs throughout the broader U.S. economy increased by 1.2 percent over the same time period. And semiconductor industry jobs have an enormous ripple effect on the broader U.S. economy. As reported by the SIA, the semiconductor industry’s employment multiplier figure (number of jobs beyond direct industry employment) is higher than that of the construction industry (1.90), the communications industry (2.52), and the automobile industry (4.64), among many others.¶ Looking ahead, **the industry transition to 450mm wafer processing will also help sustain the U.S. central role in the industry**. Currently, U.S.-based pilot lines for 450mm manufacturing are scheduled for 2015 and 2016 with high-volume manufacturing targeted for 2018. While no decision has been made, the knowledge infrastructure for 450mm manufacturing will reside in the U.S., and the challenges of bringing larger wafers online synchronously with an advanced node, indicates the first generation 450 mega fabs will be located in North America. ¶ **Another key trend that favors the U.S. microelectronics industry is the growing complexity semiconductor manufacturing and the interdependencies with the supply chain**. In addition to geometric scaling and the planned transition to 450mm wafer processing, the industry is implementing complex new transistor architectures based on new materials and processes, 3D stacked ICs, and other technologies requiring complex co-design, co-development and joint development agreements. Increasingly, these challenges are being addressed through new collaboration models involving leading fabless chip firms like Qualcomm and NVIDIA and top EDA companies such as Synopsys and Mentor Graphics. These new collaboration models are extending to the key subsystem and component suppliers. ¶ **Entrepreneurialism is another key asset of the U.S. semiconductor ecosystem.** Approximately **one billion annually in venture capital is invested in new U.S. semiconductor firms and technologies, more than any other region by far**. **Many of the technologies that will drive next generation semiconductor demand and enable next generation manufacturing will be delivered by firms that do not even exist yet, many of whom will move to the U.S. from overseas to be near leading-edge customers and investors.**

**Alt causes to CIR**

**Savala 13**

[Karen, president, SEMI Americas, “U.S. Semiconductor Market Poised for Long-Term Growth,” 6/4, Semi, <http://www.semi.org/en/node/45881>]

**While the winds are blowing favorably for U.S. semiconductor manufacturers and their suppliers, critical policy initiatives are still required to ensure continued growth of the US microelectronics industry**. We desperately need to see the passage of immigration reform, especially high-skilled immigration reform to allow more H1-B visas and green cards for those in the STEM fields. In addition, **manufacturing would benefit from additional policy support, including corporate tax reform to incentivize more production in the U.S**., **While most can agree that would need some kind of fiscal reform from the federal government, it shouldn’t come at the expense of R&D investment. Respect for intellectual property rights is a strength in America, and the government should be doing what it can to bolster those credentials as well as ensuring a level playing field around the globe.**

**A2: Space Science**

**Cooperation now**

**NASA 11**

[“NASA Signs Earth Science Agreements with Brazil”, written by unspecified NASA authors, published through PR Newswire and the Sacramento Bee, 10/27, <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/10/27/4011174/nasa-signs-earth-science-agreements.html>]

During a visit to South America, **NASA Administrator Charles Bolden** Thursday **signed two cooperative Earth science agreements with**Agencia Espacial Brasileira (**AEB), NASA's counterpart** space agency **in Brazil. One** agreement **formalizes NASA-AEB scientific collaboration on the Global Precipitation Measurement, or GPM, mission, while the other extends an agreement fortheOzone CooperationMission.** "Earth observation from space is vital to understanding our planet," **Bolden said. "The technically skilled and dedicated researchers in Brazil are excellent partners for NASA, and we look forward to many more years of successful international cooperation in space-based Earth science." GPM is an Earth science mission led by NASA and** the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (**JAXA**). It will provide advanced information on rain and snow characteristics, as well as detailed 3-D views of precipitation structure. NASA and AEB will study data distribution and the use of GPM's products in Brazil, coordinate cooperative research projects, and support the exchange of scientific and engineering personnel. The Ozone Cooperation Mission uses balloon-borne instruments launched from Maxaranguape, Brazil, to study concentrations of various atmospheric constituents. Results from the mission will contribute to the understanding of the Earth's ozone layer, its generation and depletion. They also will help calibrate and verify satellite remote sensors. **NASA and AEB will share equipment,**

**data, training and technical expertise. During his week-long visit to South America, Bolden is meeting with senior government officials in Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Costa Rica, discussing potential cooperation between NASA and regional space agencies. This is the first visit of a NASA administrator to the region in nearly eight years. It is a testament to the increasingly strong capabilities of NASA's partners in these countries.**

### MPX Turns

#### CIR hurts US-Mexico trade, relations, and doesn’t stop illegal immigration.

Miroff, 2013 (Nick, June 27, 2013, “In Mexico, dismay for the border ‘surge’ proposed in U.S. Senate immigration bill”, <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-06-27/world/40226919_1_immigration-bill-busy-border-crossing-border-surge>, 7/8/2013, PB)

Mexicans have reacted sorely to proposals for a border security “surge” that would put 18,000 additional federal agents and hundreds of miles of new fencing between the two neighbors, measures that were included in a package of immigration legislation approved by the Senate on Thursday.¶ Coming less than two months after President Obama heaped praise on Mexico’s progress and its importance as a top trading partner, the Senate bill debate and the security buildup offered by the amendment, known as Corker-Hoeven, has reminded Mexicans that much of the United States views their country warily.¶ Mexico is the largest source of illegal drugs and unauthorized migrants entering the United States. But Mexicans have bristled at a debate that has focused heavily on building new walls along the border, rather than wider doors for legitimate trade and migration to pass through.¶ Of the estimated 11 million immigrants living unlawfully in the United States, at least 6 million are believed to be from Mexico.¶ Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto’s administration has kept noticeably quiet on the U.S. debate, saying only that his government supports the reform effort.¶ However, the $46 billion in additional security measures offered by the amendment prompted Mexican officials to break their silence this week, when Foreign Minister Jose Antonio Meade told reporters here that “fences don't unite.”¶ “Fences are not a solution to the migration phenomenon, and they are not congruent with a safe and modern border,” Meade said. “They don’t contribute to the development of a competitive region that both countries are trying to build.”

#### Turn-CIR doesn’t stop illegal immigration and unleashes a flood of low-skilled workers, causing wages for low-skill workers to collapse

Kristol and Lowery 7/9 (William and Rich, Editor of The Weekly Standard and editor of the National Review, 7/9/2013, “Kill the Bill”, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/352919/kill-bill-william-kristol-rich-lowry>, 7/9/2013, PB)

The bill’s first fatal deficiency is that it doesn’t solve the illegal-immigration problem. The enforcement provisions are riddled with exceptions, loopholes, and waivers. Every indication is that they are for show and will be disregarded, just as prior notional requirements to build a fence or an entry/exit visa system have been – and just as President Obama has recently announced he’s ignoring aspects of Obamacare that are inconvenient to enforce on schedule. Why won’t he waive a requirement for the use of E-Verify just as he’s unilaterally delayed the employer mandate? The fact that the legalization of illegal immigrants comes first makes it all the more likely that enforcement provisions will be ignored the same way they were after passage of the 1986 amnesty.¶ Marco Rubio says he doesn’t want to have to come back ten years from now and deal with the same illegal-immigration problem. But that’s exactly what the CBO says will happen under his own bill. According to the CBO analysis of the bill, it will reduce illegal immigration by as little as a third or by half at most. By one estimate, this means there will be about 7.5 million illegal immigrants here in ten years. And this is under the implausible assumption that the Obama administration would administer the law as written. ¶ The bill’s changes in legal immigration are just as ill considered. Everyone professes to agree that our system should be tilted toward high-skilled immigration, but the Gang of Eight bill unleashes a flood of additional low-skilled immigration. The last thing low-skilled native and immigrant workers already here should have to deal with is wage-depressing competition from newly arriving workers. Nor is the new immigration under the bill a panacea for the long-term fiscal ills of entitlements, as often argued, because those programs are redistributive and most of the immigrants will be low-income workers.